

REDACTED

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
CAMDEN VICINAGE**

EAGLE VIEW TECHNOLOGIES, INC., and
PICTOMETRY INTERNATIONAL CORP.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

XACTWARE SOLUTIONS, INC., and
VERISK ANALYTICS, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:15-cv-07025

Hon. Robert B. Kugler, U.S.D.J.

Hon. Joel Schneider, U.S.M.J.

Final Pretrial Conference:

April 1, 2019 at 10:00 AM (D.E. 559)

Jury Selection and Trial:

June 10, 2019 at 9:00 AM (D.E. 565)

PROPOSED JOINT FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER

		PTO Page	Tab(s)
I	Jurisdiction and Brief Summary of the Case	2	-
II	Stipulated Facts	5	2
III	Plaintiff's Contested Facts	5	3
IV	Defendants' Contested Facts	5	4
V	Witnesses and Summary of Testimony	5	5A-5B
VI	Expert Witnesses	6	6A-6E
VII	Exhibits	8	7A-7B
VIII	Law	9	8A-8B
IX	Miscellaneous	9	-
X	Jury Trial	20	-

The following shall constitute the Final Pretrial Order pursuant to Rule 16, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This Final Pretrial Order shall govern the conduct of the trial of this case. Amendments to this Joint Final Pretrial Order will be allowed only in exceptional circumstances to prevent manifest injustice, or under any other circumstances permitted by the Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(e). Counsel are urged to move to amend in a timely fashion any portion of the Joint Final Pretrial Order that must be changed or modified between the filing of the Joint final Pretrial Order and the trial date.

APPEARANCES:

Plaintiff's Counsel

Liza M. Walsh
Hector D. Ruiz
Eleonore Ofosu-Antwi
WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP
One Riverfront Plaza
1037 Raymond Boulevard, Suite 600
Newark, NJ 07102
(973) 757-1100

Adam R. Alper
Brandon H. Brown
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 439-1400

Michael W. De Vries
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 680-8400

Leslie M. Schmidt
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Ave
New York, NY 10022
(212) 446-4800

Gianni Cutri
Joel R. Merkin
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
300 North LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 862-2000

Defendants' Counsel

Scott S. Christie
Matthew A. Sklar
Ravin R. Patel
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
Four Gateway Center
100 Mulberry Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102
(973) 848-5388

Lee Carl Bromberg
Wyley S. Proctor
Brian M. Seeve
Thomas R. Fulford
Thomas F. Foley
James Thomson
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
265 Franklin St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 449-6500

PART I. JURISDICTION AND BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE CASE

1. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 *et seq.* This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Subject matter jurisdiction is not disputed. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b). For purposes of this action only, no party has contested personal jurisdiction or venue.
2. EagleView alleges infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,078,436 (the “’436 patent”), 8,170,840 (the “’840 patent”), 9,129,376 (the “’376 patent”), 8,825,454 (the “’454 patent”), 8,818,770 (the “’770 patent”), and 9,135,737 (the “’737 patent”).
3. The asserted claims (“Asserted Claims”) are:

Asserted Patents	Asserted Claims
’436 patent	Claims 2, 21, and 36
’840 patent	Claims 10 and 18
’376 patent	Claims 17, 20, and 23
’454 patent	Claim 26
’770 patent	Claim 12
’737 patent	Claim 25

4. EagleView contends that Defendants’ infringement is willful and that EagleView is entitled to damages, including lost profits, sufficient to compensate it for Defendants’ infringement. Defendants contend that they do not infringe and are not liable for infringement of any of the Asserted Claims, that there is no basis for assertion of willful infringement, and that all of the Asserted Claims are invalid.
5. EagleView seeks:
 - i. a judgment declaring that the Asserted Claims are not invalid;
 - ii. a judgment declaring that the Asserted Claims are infringed under §§ 271(a), (f), and (g);
 - iii. a judgment declaring that Defendants have induced and continue to induce the infringement of the Asserted Patents;

- iv. a judgment permanently enjoining Defendants from engaging in the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer to sell and/or importation of the Accused Products and anything that is not more than colorably different than the Accused Products until the expiration of the Asserted Patents, or alternatively, for ongoing royalties for Defendants' ongoing infringement;
 - v. a judgment declaring that Defendants' infringement of the Asserted Patents is willful and that EagleView is entitled to enhanced damages;
 - vi. a judgment declaring that EagleView is entitled to damages including lost profits to compensate EagleView for Defendants' infringement, including price erosion damages;
 - vii. a judgment declaring that EagleView is entitled to damages of at least a reasonable royalty to compensate EagleView for Defendants' infringement;
 - viii. a judgment declaring that EagleView is entitled to an accounting¹ and pre- and post-judgment interest;
 - ix. a judgment declaring that this is an exceptional case and awarding EagleView its attorneys' fees and costs; and
 - x. a judgment declaring that Defendants have failed to establish each of the affirmative defenses listed in their Second Amended Answer, Affirmative Defenses, Counterclaims, and Jury Demand (Dkt. No. 238)².
6. Defendants seek:
- i. a judgment declaring that the Asserted Claims are invalid;
 - ii. a judgment declaring that they do not infringe, have not infringed, and are not liable for infringement of any of the Asserted Claims and that there is no basis for assertion of willful infringement;

¹ Defendants dispute that EagleView is entitled to an accounting because Plaintiff failed to request relief in the form of an accounting. Plaintiff disagrees with Defendants' position. For example, Plaintiff's first amended complaint requested "damages arising from Xactware's and Verisk's infringement" and further sought "other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper." Dkt. No. 30. Plaintiff is thus properly seeking an accounting. *See Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.*, 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013); *see also Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.*, 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).

² On March 28, 2018, the Court granted EagleView's motion to dismiss the inequitable conduct counterclaim (Count XIX) in Defendants' Second Amended Answer, and to strike from the Answer Defendants' Twelfth Affirmative Defense of inequitable conduct. *See* Dkt. Nos. 408 and 409. As such, Defendants' inequitable-conduct defense and counterclaim are no longer at issue in this case.

- iii. a judgment declaring that EagleView is not entitled to any damages—whether as lost profits, price erosion, reasonable royalty, or otherwise;
- iv. a judgment declaring that EagleView is not entitled to pre- or post-judgment interest;
- v. a judgment rejecting Eagle View’s request for attorneys’ fees and costs;
- vi. a judgment declaring that EagleView has failed to establish each of the claims in its amended complaint dated November 30, 2015 along with a dismissal of its amended complaint with prejudice (Dkt. No. 30);
- vii. a judgment declaring that Defendants have prevailed on their Counterclaims asserted against EagleView;
- viii. a permanent injunction prohibiting EagleView, its officers, its agents, its servants, its employees, its attorneys, and those in active concert or participation with them directly or indirectly from asserting or threatening to assert infringement of any of the Asserted Claims against Defendants or any of their agents, employees, representatives, strategic business partners, distributors, contractors, customers, advisors, and investors; and
- ix. a judgment declaring that this is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285 in favor of Defendants and awarding Defendants their attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses.

PART II. STIPULATED FACTS

The parties have stipulated to the facts attached at **Tab 2**.


PART III. PLAINTIFF’S CONTESTED FACTS

Plaintiff’s statement of the facts it intends to prove at trial is attached at **Tab 3**.

PART IV. DEFENDANTS’ CONTESTED FACTS:

Defendants’ statement of the facts they intend to prove at trial is attached at **Tab 4**.

PART V. WITNESSES AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY:

 Leave of Court,
Absent ~~an extraordinary showing of good cause,~~ only the witnesses whose names and addresses are listed herein will be permitted to testify at the time of trial. The listing of a witness on a party’s witness list does not require that party to call that witness to testify, either in person

or by deposition. In the event a party seeks to call a substitute witness, the parties agree they will make an application to the Court to amend the Joint Final Pretrial Order.

A. Plaintiff's Witnesses and Summary of Their Testimony

Information concerning Plaintiff's witnesses is attached at **Tab 5A**.

B. Defendants' Witnesses and Summary of Their Testimony

Information concerning Defendants' witnesses is attached at **Tab 5B**.

PART VI. EXPERT WITNESSES:

Any expert not listed in this portion of the Joint Final Pretrial Order shall not be permitted to testify at the time of trial. Additionally, the *curriculum vitae* of every expert expected to testify at the time of trial shall be attached to this Joint Final Pretrial Order.

1. Plaintiff's expert witnesses are:

- a) Robert L. Stevenson, Ph.D. (*curriculum vitae* attached at **Tab 6A**)
- b) Jonathan I. Arnold, Ph.D. (*curriculum vitae* attached at **Tab 6B**)

2. Defendants' expert witnesses are:

- Geoff Cohen, Ph.D. (*curriculum vitae* attached at **Tab 6C**)
- Joseph Mundy, Ph.D. (*curriculum vitae* attached at **Tab 6D**)
- Philip Green (*curriculum vitae* attached at **Tab 6E**)

PART VII. EXHIBITS³

The parties are not required to list exhibits that will be used, if at all, only for impeachment.⁴

A. Plaintiff's Exhibits and Defendants' Objections

A list of Plaintiff's exhibits that it may offer into evidence is attached at **Tab 7A**.

Defendants' objections are also contained in the list.

B. Defendants' Exhibits and Plaintiff's Objections

A list of Defendants' exhibits that it may offer into evidence is attached at **Tab 7B**.

Plaintiff's objections are also contained in the list.

PART VIII. LAW

A. Plaintiff's Statement of the Legal Issues in this Case

Plaintiff's statement of the legal issues in this case is attached at **Tab 8A**.

B. Defendants' Statement of the Legal Issues in this Case

Defendants' statement of the legal issues in this case is attached at **Tab 8B**.

³ To the extent the Court's ruling on the parties' motions *in limine* impacts the admissibility of any exhibits on the parties' exhibit list, the parties may serve redacted exhibits in accordance with the Court's ruling.

⁴ On April 15, 2019, the Parties supplemented the following documents underlying the parties' respective damages calculations with additional data through March 2019: EV01427937; EV01552476; EV01553685; EV01553466; EV01553683; XW00942354; XW00942356. By May 3, 2019, the Parties may provide updated damages calculations based solely on this additional data; the Parties may not otherwise provide new, revised, or updated expert opinions regarding damages.

PART IX. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Motions *in Limine*⁵

- i. Plaintiff intends to file the following Motions *in limine*:
 1. Exclude any argument, evidence, testimony, or reference to irrelevant, potentially inflammatory remarks, concerning, for example, race, politics, or sex.
 2. Exclude any argument, evidence, testimony, or suggestion that any of Defendants' technology is invalidating prior art to the Asserted Patents, including Aerial Sketch v.1.
 3. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding Defendants' patents, including any suggestion that the existence of Defendants' patents is a reason they do not infringe the Asserted Patents.
 4. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding Defendants' stricken and dismissed inequitable conduct defense and/or counterclaim, and regarding the parties dropping patents and claims from this action.
 5. Exclude any argument, evidence, testimony, or reference to any of Defendants' invalidity theories estopped by *inter partes* review decisions.
 6. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony that Xactware does not and did not willfully infringe the asserted patents.
 7. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony that is inconsistent with the Court's claim constructions or the parties' stipulated constructions.
 8. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony relating to any prior legal disputes or litigation between the parties, specifically *Eagle View Technologies, Inc. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-01913 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 29, 2012).
 9. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony related to any equitable issues to be decided by the Court, including references to Vista and the Vista and Verisk Merger Agreements.
- ii. Defendants intend to file the following motions *in limine*:
 1. Exclude references to *inter partes* review proceedings concerning the Asserted Patents or any other patent previously asserted in this case, and

⁵ See Footnote 3.

any subsequent appeals of these *inter partes* review proceedings to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (collectively, the “IPR Proceedings”), as well as transcripts or recordings of hearings and oral argument in the IPR Proceedings, briefs and other documents from the IPR Proceedings containing attorney argument, expert testimony from the IPR Proceedings, and the results of and any documents containing rulings and decisions in the IPR Proceedings.

2. Exclude any argument, evidence, testimony, or suggestion that Eagle View is entitled to any pre-issuance damages under a provisional rights theory pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §154(d).⁶
3. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding the statements made by Scott Stephenson in connection with the January 15, 2014 investor call.
4. Preclude Plaintiff from presenting, proffering, or relying on any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding the Doctrine of Equivalents.⁷
5. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding, and preclude Plaintiff from relying whatsoever on the following, per previous Order of this Court (Dkt. 330):
 - a. The Doctrine of Equivalents, including the following arguments or theories, which were stricken by the Court:
 - i. that a “roof estimation module” may be logically or physically split or separated between different software threads, processes, tools, widgets, components, processors, cores, computers, network devices, or applications, or be implemented by means of parallel and distributed computing, such as splitting a program between multiple distinct hardware components or across networked devices

⁶ During the Parties’ conference, Plaintiff indicated it would be willing to stipulate on this issue. At Plaintiff’s request, Defendants have proposed the following stipulation: “Plaintiff will not present any argument, evidence, testimony, or suggestion that EagleView is entitled to any pre-issuance damages or pre-reexamination certificate issuance damages.” Defendants await Plaintiff’s response.

⁷ At Plaintiff’s request, Defendants have proposed the following stipulation: “Plaintiff will not present, proffer, or rely on any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding any theory of infringement under the Doctrine of Equivalents.” Defendants await Plaintiff’s response.

- and still meet the limitations of the asserted claims;
and
 - ii. that a “memory” on separate hardware boxes, such as hard drives, flash drives, RAM, processor caches, network storage, servers storing information over a network or the Internet still meets the limitations of the asserted claims.
- b. Source code Bates-numbered higher than XWSC648;
 - c. Plaintiff’s amended L. Pat. R. 3.2(b) disclosures listed in their July 12 and 19, 2017 supplemental answers to interrogatory 7, regarding documents and source code evidencing conception and reduction to practice; and
 - d. Plaintiff’s new conception and reduction to practice dates in their July 12 and 19, 2017 answers to Interrogatory 7, to the extent the new dates are based on Plaintiff’s stricken documents and source code.⁸

⁸ During the Parties’ conference, Plaintiff indicated that it would be willing to stipulate on this issue. At Plaintiff’s request, Defendants have proposed the following stipulation: “Plaintiff will not, per previous Order of this Court (Dkt. 330), present any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding:

- i. theories raised under the Doctrine of Equivalents, including the theories, previously stricken by the Court, that: (1) a “roof estimation module” may be logically or physically split or separated between different software threads, processes, tools, widgets, components, processors, cores, computers, network devices, or applications, or be implemented by means of parallel and distributed computing, such as splitting a program between multiple distinct hardware components or across networked devices and still meet the limitations of the asserted claims; and (2) a “memory” on separate hardware boxes, such as hard drives, flash drives, RAM, processor caches, network storage, servers storing information over a network or the Internet still meets the limitations of the asserted claims;
- ii. theories based on source code with Bates numbers higher than XWSC648;
- iii. theories presented in Plaintiff’s amended L. Pat. R. 3.2(b) disclosures listed in their July 12 and 19, 2017 supplemental answers to interrogatory 7, regarding documents and source code evidencing conception and reduction to practice; and
- iv. Plaintiff’s new conception and reduction to practice dates in their July 12 and 19, 2017 answers to Interrogatory 7, to the extent the new dates are based on Plaintiff’s stricken documents and source code.

6. Exclude any argument, evidence, or testimony regarding or referring in any way to House Report, including that House Report practices or embodies any element of any Asserted Claim.
7. Exclude any argument, purported evidence, testimony, or suggestion of direct infringement by Verisk, infringement by Verisk pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(g), infringement of the '737 patent by Xactware pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1) or (2), or any other theory of infringement not disclosed in EagleView's Second Amended Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions Pursuant to L. Pat. R. 3.1.
8. Exclude any argument, evidence, testimony, or suggestion that EagleView is entitled to an accounting or any other relief not requested in the First Amended Complaint.⁹
9. Preclude Plaintiff from presenting, proffering, introducing or relying upon (a) any argument or testimony that the firm of McCarter & English, LLP, counsel for Defendants, represented Verisk in any attempted acquisition of EagleView; and (b) any documentary evidence that is not redacted to remove portions that have been identified to Plaintiff as privileged or otherwise reference the firm of McCarter & English, LLP or the names of any of its attorneys, including exhibits PTX-916 and PTX-929.

B. Order of Presentation

Subject to the Court's approval, the parties have agreed as follows:

1. Plaintiff will present its opening statement first followed by Defendants' opening statement.
2. Plaintiff has the burden of proof on patent infringement. As such, Plaintiff will present its case-in-chief first, followed by Defendants' case-in-chief in response to Plaintiff.

Defendants await Plaintiff's response.

⁹ At Plaintiff's request, Defendants have proposed the following stipulation: "If Plaintiff prevails, Plaintiff may be entitled to an accounting limited to the post-verdict infringing sales, if any, that are substantially related to the direct infringement by Defendants that the Court finds supported by the existing record. *See Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.*, 711 F.3d 1348, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2013)." Defendants await Plaintiff's response.

3. Defendants have the burden of proof on patent invalidity. As such, invalidity will be part of Defendants' case-in-chief.
4. Plaintiff will then present its case in response to Defendants' invalidity case.

C. Time Allotted to Each Party

1. Subject to the Court's approval, the parties will provide opening statements of up to 60 minutes for Plaintiff and up to 60 minutes for Defendants.
2. Subject to the Court's approval, the parties will have equal time to present their cases.

D. Witnesses

1. The parties agree that any fact witnesses, except for a party representative attending trial, appearing in person shall be sequestered until he/she testifies, and any trial testimony preceding the testimony of the fact witness cannot be disclosed to that witness directly or indirectly.
2. Regarding the order of witnesses, Plaintiff proposes: Each fact witness presenting live testimony may testify only once during each segment of the trial (*e.g.*, once in Plaintiff's case-in-chief, once in Defendants' case-in-chief, and once in Plaintiff's rebuttal). The parties may call witnesses on either party's "Will Call for Live Testimony" list or "May Call for Live Testimony or by Deposition" list.
3. Regarding the order of witnesses, Defendants propose: Neither party will call any witness listed in the opposing party's "Will Call for Live Testimony" list during presentation of that party's case-in-chief, unless such witness has previously been called to testify. Each fact witness presenting live testimony at trial will testify once, and as such, the scope of cross examination may exceed the scope of the direct examination. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the parties may call their own witnesses in rebuttal even if they previously testified at trial. Defendants oppose any attempt by Plaintiff to call Defendants' witnesses to testify during Plaintiff's case-in-chief.
4. Pursuant to the Court's April 8, 2019 order (Dkt. 573), and by agreement of the Parties, Defendants took the deposition of Hugh West on April 23, 2019.

E. Additional Stipulations

1. **Witnesses.** By 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time two calendar days before the expected trial day on which a witness will be called to testify, each party

will identify by email to the opposing party the witnesses it intends to call on that trial day, the order in which those witnesses will be called, and whether those witnesses will be called live or by deposition (if deposition designations are to be played in court). For example, for witnesses expected to be called on Monday, June 10, 2019, notice shall be given by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Saturday, June 8, 2019.

2. **Playing of Deposition Designations.** To the extent that the Court requests that the parties play a witness's designations at trial, all portions of the testimony designated by any party will be played at the same time, including the parties' affirmative designations and counter-designations. All designated testimony will be introduced in the sequence in which the testimony was originally given.
3. **Documents.** Legible photostatic or other copies of documents (or portions thereof) may be marked for identification, and offered and received in evidence at the trial, with the same force and effect as the originals, subject to correction should error appear and subject to any and all objections as could be made to the original thereof. The originals of such copies shall be available for inspection at the trial upon reasonable notice.
4. **Exhibits.**
 - a. Any exhibit listed by a party may be offered as an exhibit by that party or by another party, subject to any evidentiary objections by the opposing party.
 - b. Any exhibit, once admitted at trial, may be used equally by any party, subject to the Federal Rules of Evidence.
 - c. The parties agree that the listing of an exhibit by a party does not waive any objections that such party may have by the use of the same exhibit by another party.
 - d. The parties agree that any description of a document or other material on an exhibit list is provided for convenience only and shall not be used as an admission or otherwise as evidence regarding the document or material.
 - e. With the exception of documents subject to the parties motions *in limine*, the parties agree that they will not dispute the authenticity of any document that was produced during discovery, which on its face appears to have been authored by an employee or officer of the producing party, or by a third-party engaged by the producing party in the ordinary course of business, and that such documents shall be deemed *prima facie* authentic, subject to the right of the party against whom such a document is offered to adduce evidence to the

contrary and subject to any contrary determination or ruling by the Court.

- f. Plaintiff's demonstratives will be identified with PDX numbers.
- g. Defendants' demonstratives will be identified with DDX numbers.
- h. The parties agree that if any party removes or otherwise withdraws an exhibit from its Exhibit List, another party may amend its Exhibit List to include that same exhibit. The parties also agree that the parties may make objections to such exhibit, other than an objection based on untimely listing.

5. **Objections to Deposition Designations Played in Court.** If the Court elects to hear deposition testimony played during trial, the following procedures will apply:

- a. The introducing party will identify the particular designated deposition testimony (by page and line) from its previous designations that is actually intended to be played or read at trial, or a disclosure that all pages and lines previously designated will be played, by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time two calendar days before introducing the deposition testimony. For avoidance of doubt, if the introducing party intends to play or read designated testimony on Monday, June 10, 2019, notice shall be given by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Saturday, June 8, 2019. The advanced notification provision for designations does not apply to designations to be used during cross-examination.
- b. By 8:30 p.m. Eastern Time the same day, the other party will identify any specific pages and lines from its counter-designations that it wishes to be introduced, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 32(a)(6), and any testimony to which it continues to object.
- c. By 9:30 p.m. Eastern Time the same day, the introducing party will identify any counter-designated testimony to which it continues to object.
- d. By 10:30 p.m. Eastern Time the same day, the parties shall meet and confer to resolve any objections to designated deposition testimony.
- e. If objections to disputed testimony are not resolved by this process, the parties shall present such objections to the Court on the next trial day (the day before the intended deposition use).
- f. If a party opts to introduce deposition testimony, any counter-designation of that same witnesses' testimony must be submitted in the same medium. Any objections or attorney colloquy included in

the designated testimony should be removed unless required to clarify the record (*i.e.* discussion of scope of 30(b)(6) testimony).

- g. The party electing to introduce deposition testimony shall be responsible for putting together the video file of the deposition designations and any counter designations not objected to by the parties, and the video files must be exchanged in the same manner as demonstrative exhibits used for direct examination, as governed by Paragraph 9(c), *i.e.* by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time the day before the deposition testimony will be introduced.
- 6. **Exhibits Introduced Through Deposition Designations.** If designated testimony to be played in open court includes the use of an exhibit to which a party has asserted an objection, such objections will be handled in the same manner as the procedures set forth for the resolution of objections to exhibits to be used on direct examination pursuant to Paragraph 8 below.
- 7. **Exchange of Exhibits for Direct Examinations or Opening Statements.**
 - a. For exhibits to be used in connection with direct examination of fact witnesses, each party will provide by e-mail to the opposing party a list of all exhibits to be used, other than demonstratives, whose exchange shall be governed by Paragraph 9 below, by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time one calendar day before they will be used at trial. For example, for exhibits to be used in a direct examination of a fact witness who is disclosed as testifying on Monday, June 10, 2019, the witness' exhibits shall be disclosed by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Sunday, June 9, 2019. The party receiving identification of exhibits intended for use in direct examination will inform the identifying party of any objections by 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day. The parties will meet and confer as soon as possible thereafter to resolve such objections, but in any event by 10:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day.
 - b. For exhibits to be used in connection with direct examination of expert witnesses, each party will provide by e-mail to the opposing party a list of all exhibits to be used, other than demonstratives, whose exchange shall be governed by Paragraph 9 below, by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time two calendar days before they will be used at trial. For example, for exhibits to be used in a direct examination of an expert witness who is disclosed as testifying on Monday, June 10, 2019, the expert witness' exhibits shall be disclosed by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Saturday, June 8, 2019. The party receiving identification of exhibits intended for use in direct examination will inform the identifying party of any objections by 6:00 p.m. EST the following day. The parties will meet and confer as soon as possible

thereafter to resolve such objections, but in any event by 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time the following day.

- c. For exhibits to be used in connection with opening statements, each party will provide by e-mail to the opposing party a list of all exhibits to be used, other than demonstratives, whose exchange shall be governed by Paragraph 9 below, by noon Eastern Time the day before opening statements. The party receiving identification of exhibits for opening statements will inform the party identifying the exhibits of any objections by 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day, and the parties will meet and confer as soon as possible thereafter to resolve such objections, but in any event by 6:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day. If good faith efforts to resolve the objections fail, the party objecting to the demonstratives may bring its objections to the Court's attention prior to the opening statement.
 - d. The advanced notification provision for exhibits does not apply to exhibits to be used during cross-examination, whether for impeachment or to be offered into evidence.
 - e. Any party may use an exhibit that is listed on the other party's exhibit list, subject to the other party's opportunity to object to its introduction and subject to all applicable evidentiary objections. Any exhibit, once admitted at trial, may be used equally by any party, subject to the Federal Rules of Evidence.
8. **Objections to Exhibits to be used on Direct Examination.** If good faith efforts to resolve the objections fail, the party objecting to the exhibits may bring its objections to the Court's attention when the exhibit is offered into evidence.
9. **Exchange of Demonstrative Exhibits.**
- a. The party seeking to use a demonstrative exhibit will provide a color representation of the demonstrative to the other side in PDF, PowerPoint, or some other commonly viewable format according to the schedule below. However, for video or animations, the party seeking to use the demonstrative will provide it to the other side via FTP or on a DVD, CD, or USB drive. For irregularly sized physical demonstrative exhibits, the party seeking to use the demonstrative will provide a color representation as a PDF of 8.5 x 11 inch copies of the exhibits and make the original available for inspection by the opposing party.
 - b. For demonstrative exhibits to be used in connection with opening statements, each party will exchange by e-mail or FTP PDFs, or by courier a DVD, CD or USB drive, of such demonstrative exhibits by

noon Eastern Time the day before opening statements. The party receiving identification of demonstrative exhibits for opening statements will inform the party identifying the exhibits of any objections by 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day, and the parties will meet and confer as soon as possible thereafter to resolve such objections, but in any event by 6:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day. If good faith efforts to resolve the objections fail, the party objecting to the demonstratives may bring its objections to the Court's attention prior to the opening statement.

- c. For demonstrative exhibits to be used in connection with direct examination of fact witnesses, each party will exchange by e-mail or FTP PDFs, or by courier a DVD, CD or USB drive, of such demonstrative exhibits by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time the day before they will be used at trial. To clarify, if a party plans to use demonstrative exhibits in the morning of a Monday, the party will need to exchange the demonstrative exhibits by Sunday 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The party receiving identification of demonstrative exhibits will inform the party identifying the exhibits of any objections by 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time, and the parties will meet and confer as soon as possible thereafter to resolve such objections, but in any event by 10:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day. If good faith efforts to resolve the objections fail, the party objecting to the demonstratives may bring its objections to the Court's attention prior to the witness for whom the demonstratives were created being called to the stand.
- d. For demonstrative exhibits to be used in connection with direct examination of expert witnesses, each party will exchange by e-mail or FTP PDFs, or by courier a DVD, CD or USB drive, of such demonstrative exhibits by 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time two calendar days before they will be used at trial. To clarify, if a party plans to use demonstrative exhibits in the morning of a Monday, the party will need to exchange the demonstrative exhibits by Saturday 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The party receiving identification of demonstrative exhibits will inform the party identifying the exhibits of any objections by 6:00 p.m. Eastern Time the following day, and the parties will meet and confer as soon as possible thereafter to resolve such objections, but in any event by 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time that same day. If good faith efforts to resolve the objections fail, the party objecting to the demonstratives may bring its objections to the Court's attention prior to the witness for whom the demonstratives were created being called to the stand.

- e. There is no obligation to disclose demonstratives that will be created during live testimony or that will be used or created during cross examination.

- 10. **Protective Order.** The Court has entered a Discovery Confidentiality Order to safeguard the confidentiality of certain of the parties business and technical information, as well as that of third parties.

PART X. JURY TRIAL

- 1. Trial is scheduled to commence on June 10, 2019 (D.E. 565).
- 2. The Parties believe the trial commencing on June 10, 2019 can be completed in 10 business days.

- 3. Deadlines:

Subject to the Court's Approval.

- i. Motions in Limine:

- a) Opening Submissions: May 2, 2019
- b) Opposition Submissions: May 16, 2019
- c) Reply Submissions: May 23, 2019

- ii. Trial Brief: June 3, 2019

- iii. Jury Instructions: June 3, 2019

- iv. Voir Dire Questions: June 3, 2019

- v. Jury Questionnaire¹⁰: June 3, 2019

CONCLUDING CERTIFICATION

We hereby certify by the affixing of our signatures to this Joint Final Pretrial Order that it reflects the efforts of all counsel and that we have carefully and completely reviewed all parts of this Order prior to its submission to the Court. Further, it is acknowledged that amendments to this

¹⁰ Subject to the Court's approval, and to the extent the parties agree upon a jury questionnaire to be provided to the jury, the parties will submit an agreed-upon questionnaire.

Joint Final Pretrial Order will not be permitted except where the Court determines that manifest injustice would result if the amendment is not allowed.

Dated: April 30, 2019

s/Liza M. Walsh

Liza M. Walsh
Hector D. Ruiz
Eleonore Ofosu-Antwi
WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA
LLP One Riverfront Plaza
1037 Raymond Boulevard, Suite 600
Newark, NJ 07102
(973) 757-1100

Adam R. Alper
Brandon H. Brown
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 439-1400

Michael W. De Vries
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 680-8400

Leslie M. Schmidt
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Ave
New York, NY 10022
(212) 446-4800

Gianni Cutri
Joel R. Merkin
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
300 North LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 862-2000

Counsel for Plaintiff


s/Scott S. Christie

Scott S. Christie
Matthew A. Sklar
Ravin R. Patel
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
Four Gateway Center
100 Mulberry Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102
(973) 848-5388

Lee Carl Bromberg
Wyley S. Proctor
Brian M. Seeve
Thomas R. Fulford
Thomas F. Foley
James Thomson
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
265 Franklin St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 449-6500

Counsel for Defendants

Entry of the foregoing Joint Final Pretrial Order is hereby APPROVED this 30th day of April, 2019.



HON. JOEL SCHNEIDER
United States Magistrate Judge
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

PART II. STIPULATED FACTS:

The parties stipulate to the following facts, which require no proof at trial:

I. The Parties

1. Plaintiff EagleView is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Washington, having a principal place of business at 3700 Monte Villa Parkway, Suite 200, Bothell, WA 98021.
2. Defendant Xactware is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 1100 West Traverse Parkway, Lehi, UT 84043.
3. Defendant Verisk is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 545 Washington Boulevard, Jersey City, NJ 07310.
4. Xactware is a wholly-owned indirect subsidiary of Verisk.
5. Xactware was reorganized to form Geomni, Inc. (“Geomni,”) a wholly-owned division of Insurance Services Office, Inc., which is in turn a wholly-owned division of Verisk. The parties entered into a Stipulation with Respect to Geomni, which was entered by the Court on March 13, 2018. Dkt. No. 406.
6. Xactware and Geomni have directly competed with EagleView, including in the construction and insurance markets, by offering for sale reports generated by Aerial Sketch v.2, Roof InSight, and Property InSight.
7. Verisk attempted to acquire EagleView in 2012 and submitted an offer for 100% of EagleView’s capital stock. The bid amounted to [REDACTED] up front, with an earn-out payment of up to an additional [REDACTED] to be made based on 2013 revenue and EBITDA targets.

8. Verisk Analytics, Inc. (“Verisk”) offered to acquire EagleView Technology Corporation in January 2014 for approximately \$650 million.
9. EagleView Technology Corporation agreed to be acquired by Verisk in January 2014 for approximately \$650 million.
10. Verisk and EagleView Technology Corporation signed a detailed agreement (the “Verisk Agreement”) dated January 14, 2014 pursuant to which Verisk would acquire EagleView Technology Corporation for approximately \$650 million.
11. EagleView does not publicly disclose or otherwise make publicly available its operational software or its source code for any of its Render House, Twister, or other roof estimation software programs.

II. The Asserted Patents

12. The Asserted Patents are owned by EagleView.
13. Each Asserted Patent issued on a different date:
 - a) The ’436 patent’s reexamined claims issued on August 27, 2014;
 - b) The ’840 patent issued on May 1, 2012;
 - c) The ’770 patent issued on August 26, 2014;
 - d) The ’454 patent issued on September 2, 2014;
 - e) The ’376 patent issued on September 8, 2015; and
 - f) The ’737 patent issued on September 15, 2015.

A. U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436

14. The application for the ’436 patent, which is entitled “Aerial Roof Estimation Systems and Methods,” was filed on October 16, 2008, the reexamined claims of the ’436 patent issued on August 27, 2014, and a Certificate of Correction issued on July 10, 2018.
15. Chris Pershing and David P. Carlson are the named inventors of the ’436 patent.

16. Claim 1 of the '436 patent states: "A computing system for generating a roof estimate report, the computing system comprising: a memory; a roof estimation module that is stored on the memory and that is configured, when executed, to: receive a first and a second aerial image of a building having a roof, each of the aerial images providing a different view of the roof of the building, wherein the first aerial image provides a top plan view of the roof and the second aerial image provides an oblique perspective view of the roof, and are not a stereoscopic pair; correlate the first aerial image with the second aerial image; generate, based at least in part on the correlation between the first and second aerial images, a three-dimensional model of the roof that includes a plurality of planar roof sections that each have a corresponding slope, area, and edges; and generate and transmit a roof estimate report that includes one or more top plan views of the three-dimensional model annotated with numerical values that indicate the corresponding slope, area, and length of edges of at least some of the plurality of planar roof sections using at least two different indicia for different types of roof properties."
17. Claim 2 of the '436 patent states: "The computing system of claim 1 wherein the roof estimation module is further configured to correlate the first and second aerial images by receiving an indication of one or more corresponding points on the building shown in each of the first and second aerial images."
18. Claim 18 of the '436 patent states: "A computer-implemented method for generating a roof estimate, the method comprising: receiving a first and a second aerial image of a building having a roof, each of the aerial images providing a different view of the roof of the building wherein the first aerial image provides a top plan view of the roof and the second aerial image provides a view of the roof that is other than a top plan view and neither of

the two images are part of a stereoscopic pair; correlating the first aerial image with the second aerial image; generating, based at least in part on the correlation between the first and second aerial images, a three-dimensional model of the roof that includes a plurality of planar roof sections that each have a corresponding slope, area, and edges; and transmitting a roof estimate report that includes one or more top plan views of the three-dimensional model annotated with numerical indications of at least one of the slope, area, and lengths of the edges of the plurality of planar roof sections, wherein the roof estimate report includes at least two different indicia for different types of roof properties.”

19. Claim 20 of the '436 patent states: “The method of claim 18 wherein correlating the first and second aerial images includes receiving an indication of one or more corresponding points shown in each of the first and second aerial images.”
20. Claim 21 of the '436 patent states: “The method of claim 20 wherein receiving the indication of the corresponding point includes receiving the indication from a user.”
21. Claim 36 of the '436 patent states: “A non-transitory computer-readable storage medium whose contents, which are computer executable instructions stored on the non-transitory computer-readable storage medium, when executed by a computer processor of a computing system, enable the computing system to generate a roof estimate report for a building having a roof, by causing, when executed by the computer processor of the computing system, the computing system to perform a method comprising: receiving two or more images of the building, wherein at least one of the two or more images provides an oblique perspective view of the roof and one of the images provides a top plan view of the roof; receiving an indication of pairs of points on the two or more images, each pair of points corresponding to substantially the same point on the roof depicted in each of the two

or more images; generating, based on the two or more images of the building, a three-dimensional model of the roof that includes a plurality of planar roof sections that each have a corresponding area and edges, wherein the generating, based on the two or more images of the building, the model of the roof includes generating the model of the roof based on the receiving the indication of the pairs of points on the two or more images of the building; and transmitting a roof estimate report that includes one or more views of the model, the report being annotated with numerical indications of the area and lengths of the edges of at least some of the plurality of planar roof sections, wherein the roof estimate report includes at least two different indicia for different types of roof properties.”

B. U.S. Patent No. 8,170,840

22. The '840 patent, entitled “Pitch Determination Systems and Methods for Aerial Roof Estimation,” was issued by the USPTO on May 1, 2012.
23. The application for the '840 patent was filed on May 15, 2009.
24. Chris Pershing is the named inventor of the '840 patent.
25. Claim 10 of the '840 patent states: “A computing system for generating a roof estimate report, the computing system comprising: a memory; a roof estimation module that is stored on the memory and that is configured, when executed, to: display an aerial image of a building having a roof comprising a plurality of planar roof sections that each have a corresponding pitch; display a pitch determination marker operable to indicate pitch of a planar roof section, wherein the pitch determination marker is overlaid on the aerial image of the building having the roof; receive, based on the displayed pitch determination marker, an indication of the pitch of one of the plurality of planar roof sections of the roof of the building; modify a model of the roof based on the received indication of the pitch of the one planar roof section; and provide roof measurement information based on the model of

the roof, the roof measurement information including a measure of the pitch of the one planar roof section.”

26. Claim 16 of the '840 patent states: “A non-transitory computer-readable storage medium whose contents enable a computing system to generate a roof estimate report for a building having a roof, by performing a method comprising: displaying an aerial image of a building having a roof comprising a planar roof section that has a corresponding pitch; displaying a pitch determination marker operable to indicate pitch of the planar roof section, wherein the pitch determination marker is overlaid on the aerial image of the building having the roof; receiving, based on the displayed pitch determination marker, an indication of the pitch of the planar roof section; and modifying a model of the roof based on the received indication of the pitch of the planar roof section.”
27. Claim 18 of the '840 patent states: “The non-transitory computer-readable storage medium of claim 16 wherein the method further comprises: generating a roof estimate report based on the modified model of the roof; and transmitting the generated roof estimate report.”

C. U.S. Patent No. 8,818,770

28. The '770 patent, entitled “Pitch Determination Systems and Methods for Aerial Roof Estimation,” was issued by the USPTO on August 26, 2014.
29. The application for the '770 patent was filed on April 3, 2012.
30. Chris Pershing is the named inventor of the '770 patent.
31. Claim 1 of the '770 patent states: “A computer-implemented process in a roof estimation system comprising: displaying, by the roof estimation system, a graphical user interface including a first aerial image of a roof structure of a building and also at least one first visual marker that is moveable by a user in a same display window as the first aerial image while said first aerial image is displayed within the graphical user interface; moving the

first visual marker with respect to the first aerial image of the roof structure to a first location in response to input from the user; storing data in a memory of the computer of the first location to which the first visual marker was moved; displaying a second aerial image of the roof structure of the building, the second aerial image providing a different view of the roof than the first aerial image; and displaying a location of a second visual marker on the roof structure of the building in the second aerial image of the roof structure based on an indication received from the stored data in the memory of the first location on the displayed first aerial image to which the user had moved the first visual marker; and generating and outputting a roof estimate report using a report generation engine, wherein the roof estimate report includes one or more top plan views of a model of the roof annotated with numerical values for corresponding slope, area, or lengths of the edges of at least some of the plurality of planar roof sections of the model of the roof.”

32. Claim 12 of the '770 patent states: “The process of claim 1 further comprising: performing, by the roof estimation system, digital wire frame model construction of the roof structure based on the at least one location over the roof structure in the displayed aerial imagery to which the user moved the least one first visual marker.”

D. U.S. Patent No. 8,825,454

33. The '454 patent, entitled “Concurrent Display Systems and Methods for Aerial Roof Estimation,” was issued by the USPTO on September 2, 2014.
34. The application for the '454 patent was filed on May 17, 2012.
35. Chris Pershing is the named inventor of the '454 patent.
36. Claim 26 of the '454 patent states: “A computer-implemented method in a roof estimate report system including a computer system and a memory coupled to the computer system, the method comprising: displaying, by the computer system of the roof estimate report

system, a first aerial image of a roof on a single display; displaying, by the computer system of the roof estimate report system, a second aerial image of the same roof on the same single display, the second aerial image providing a different view than the first aerial image, taken from a different angle of the same roof; displaying, by the computer system of the roof estimate report system, a first line drawing representing features of the roof overlaid on the first aerial image of the roof; displaying, by the computer system of the roof estimate report system, a second line drawing representing features of the roof overlaid on the second aerial image of the roof, the second line drawings having features in common with and that correspond to features in the first line drawing; in response to user input, changing, a line in the first line drawing representing a feature of the roof that overlies the first aerial image of the roof; changing, by the computer system of the roof estimate report system, a line in the second line drawing that corresponds to the same feature in the first line drawing that was changed by the user, the change in the second line drawing being made by the computer system in response to the change that was made by the user in the first line drawing; and generating and outputting a roof estimate report using a report generation engine, wherein the roof estimate report includes one or more top plan views of a model of the roof annotated with numerical values for corresponding slope, area, or lengths of the edges of at least some of the plurality of planar roof sections of the model of the roof.”

E. U.S. Patent No. 9,129,376

37. The '376 patent, entitled “Pitch Determination Systems and Methods for Aerial Roof Estimation,” was issued by the USPTO on September 8, 2015.
38. The application for the '376 patent was filed on July 31, 2014.
39. Chris Pershing is the named inventor of the '376 patent.

40. Claim 17 of the '376 patent states: "A computer-implemented method in a roof estimation system, the method comprising: displaying, by the roof estimation system, a graphical user interface including an aerial image of a roof structure of a building and a pitch determination marker that is an interactive user interface control that can be manipulated by the operator in order to specify pitch of the roof structure of the building; moving the pitch determination marker with respect to the aerial image of the roof structure to a first location in the graphical user interface overlaying the aerial image in response to input from the user; adjusting the pitch determination marker so that the pitch determination marker appears to lie substantially atop at least one of two adjacent planar roof sections of the aerial image of the roof structure; determining, by the roof estimation system, a pitch of the at least one of the two adjacent planar roof sections based on a configuration of the pitch determination marker; and generating and outputting, by the roof estimation system, a roof estimate report using a report generation engine, wherein the roof estimate report includes one or more top plan views of a model of the roof structure annotated with numerical values for corresponding slope, area, or lengths of edges of at least some of a plurality of planar roof sections of the roof structure, wherein the generated roof estimate report is provided for repair and/or constructing the roof structure of the building."
41. Claim 20 of the '376 patent states: "A roof estimation system comprising: at least one computer processor; and at least one memory coupled to the at least one computer processor having computer executable instructions stored thereon that, when executed, cause the at least one computer processor to: adjust a pitch determination marker overlaid on a photographic aerial image in response to manipulation of the pitch determination marker by a user so that at least a portion of the pitch determination marker substantially

aligns with at least a portion of a planar roof section of the roof in the aerial image; calculate a pitch of the planar roof section roof based on the adjustment of the pitch determination marker; store the calculated pitch in the memory; and generate and output a roof estimate report, wherein the roof estimate report includes one or more top plan views of a model of the roof annotated with numerical values for corresponding slope, area, or lengths of edges of at least some of a plurality of planar roof sections of the roof, wherein the generated roof estimate report is provided for repair and/or constructing the roof structure of the building.”

42. Claim 22 of the '376 patent states: “The system of claim 20 wherein the pitch determination marker is an envelope tool and wherein the computer executable instructions stored on the memory, when executed, cause the at least one computer processor to: change a position of a spine of the envelope tool to a position in which the spine substantially aligns with a ridge line of the roof.”
43. Claim 23 of the '376 patent states: “The system of claim 22 wherein the computer executable instructions stored on the memory, when executed, cause the at least one computer processor to: adjust an angle of a first surface of the envelope tool and a second surface of the envelope tool so that the first surface lies substantially atop a first section of the roof and the second surface lies substantially atop a second section of the roof that is adjacent to the first section at the ridge line.”

F. U.S. Patent No. 9,135,737

44. The '737 patent, entitled “Concurrent Display Systems and Methods for Aerial Roof Estimation,” was issued by the USPTO on September 15, 2015.
45. The application for the '737 patent was filed on August 1, 2014.
46. Chris Pershing is the named inventor of the '737 patent.

47. Claim 16 of the '737 patent states: "A non-transitory computer-readable storage medium, having computer executable instructions stored thereon that, when executed by at least one computer processor, cause the at least one processor to enable a computing system to generate a roof estimate report for a building having a roof, by performing a method comprising: overlaying a line drawing on corresponding locations of a roof feature of the roof on first and second aerial images of the roof, wherein the first aerial image provides a first view of the roof of the building and the second aerial image provides a second view of the roof of the building; in response to changes in the line drawing overlaid on the first aerial image, displaying corresponding changes to the line drawing overlaid on the second aerial image; and generate and output a roof estimate report using a report generation engine, wherein the roof estimate report includes numerical values for corresponding slope, area, or lengths of edges of at least some of a plurality of planar roof sections of the roof, wherein the generated roof estimate report is provided for repair and/or constructing the roof structure of the building."
48. Claim 25 of the '737 patent states: "The non-transitory computer-readable storage medium of claim 16 wherein the method further comprises: modifying a three dimensional model of the roof based at least on the modification of the line drawing overlaid on the first aerial image."

III. Claim Construction

49. The parties have agreed to constructions for several terms as set forth in the table below.

See Dkt. No. 178.

CLAIM TERM	ASSERTED CLAIMS	AGREED UPON CONSTRUCTION
"top plan view"	'436 patent, claims 2, 21, 36	"an aerial view of an object that is taken from a position vertically or nearly vertically above the object"

CLAIM TERM	ASSERTED CLAIMS	AGREED UPON CONSTRUCTION
“oblique perspective view”/ “oblique view” / “perspective view”	'436 patent. Claims 2, 36	“an aerial view of an object that is taken from a position that is neither vertically nor nearly vertically above the object”
“not a stereoscopic pair”	'436 patent, Claim 2	“a pair of images of the same object taken from different view directions”
“a roof estimation module that is stored on the memory”	'436 patent, Claim 2 '840 patent, Claim 10	“a module that is stored on the memory, and which performs image acquisition, roof modeling, and report generation functions”
“aerial image”	'840 patent, Claim 10 '770 patent, Claim 12 '376 patent. Claims 17, 20, 23	“an image taken from the air”

50. The Court’s *Markman* Order states, “the plain and ordinary meaning of each disputed claim term is clear to one of skill in the art and needs no claim construction; and therefore, no claim construction has been set forth herein.” *See* Dkt. No. 332.

IV. The Accused Products

51. Prior to January 1, 2016, Xactware was the entity making sales of the Accused Products. Between January 1, 2016 and March 15, 2017, the Geospatial Solutions business unit (also known as the Geomni business unit) of Verisk was the entity making sales of the Accused Products. From March 15, 2017 to the present, Geomni has been the entity making sales of the Accused Products.
52. Xactware provided (and Geomni provides) customer support for those who use its products as necessary, has customers located in the United States, and has employees based in the United States who provide customer support.
53. The Mass Production Tool includes graphical user interface components that can be manipulated by users.
54. Versions of the Mass Production Tool require computer memory in order to be executed.
55. The Xactware product called Property InSight has been renamed Geomni Property.

- 56. The Xactware product called Roof InSight has been renamed Geomni Roof.
- 57. Xactware provided instructions to customers on how to order Roof InSight data packages.

V. Invalidity

- 58. “Hsieh” refers to a document by Hsieh, entitled “Design and Evaluation of a Semi-Automated Site Modeling System,” Carnegie Mellon, November 1995.
- 59. “McKeown” refers to a document entitled “Chapter 9, Feature Extraction and Object Recognition, Automatic Cartographic Feature Extraction Using Photogrammetric Principles,” by D. McKeown, Jr., et al. in Digital Photogrammetry: An Addendum to the Manual of Photogrammetry; by American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (1996).
- 60. “Sungevity” refers to U.S. Patent No. 8,417,061 entitled “Methods and Systems for Provisioning Energy Systems.”
- 61. Sungevity issued on April 9, 2013.
- 62. “Avrahami,” refers to a document by Avrahami et al., entitled “Extraction of 3D Spatial Polygons Based on the Overlapping Criterion for Roof Extraction from Aerial Images,” International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, August 29-30, 2005
- 63. “Applicad,” refers to a document by Applicad, entitled “Product Bulletin – November 2002: Key features of our Roofing Software,” November 2002.
- 64. “Labe,” refers to a document entitled “Robust Techniques for Estimating Parameters of 3D Building Primitives” by Thomas Labe and Eberhard Gülch, International Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Volume XXXII, Part 2, Commission II, Proceedings of the Commission II Symposium, Data Integration: Systems and Techniques, July 13-17, 1998 (1998).

65. “Aerowest” refers to European Patent No. 1 010 966 to Aerowest GmbH, entitled “Verfahren zur Erzeugung einer drei-dimensionalen Objektbeschreibung” [Method for generating a three-dimensional object description].
66. Aerowest issued on October 23, 2002.
67. “Verma” refers to U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0061566 to Verma, entitled “Method and Apparatus for Performing Three-Dimensional Computer Modeling.”
68. Verma was published on March 23, 2006.

PART III. PLAINTIFF'S CONTESTED FACTS:

I. Plaintiff intends to prove the following contested facts with regard to liability:

A. Direct Infringement

1. Xactware has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 patent, Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent, Claim 12 of the '770 patent, Claim 26 of the '454 patent, Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 patent, and Claim 25 of the '737 patent.
2. Xactware has, without authority, made, used, offered for sale, sold and/or imported in the United States the Accused Products¹ thereby infringing the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents.
3. Pursuant to the Stipulation with Respect to Geomni, which was entered by the Court on March 13, 2018 (Dkt. No. 406), any and all references to "Xactware" include "Geomni," any and all references to "Roof InSight" include "Geomni Roof," and any and all references to "Property InSight" include "Geomni Property."
4. Prior to 2013, EagleView and Pictometry International Corp. ("Pictometry") were separate legal entities. In 2013, EagleView merged with Pictometry.
5. Defendants' Property InSight; Roof InSight; and the Mass Production Tool in combination with Xactimate, Property InSight, and Roof InSight are alleged to infringe the '436 patent.
6. Defendants' Xactimate in combination with Aerial Sketch version 2; Property InSight; Roof InSight; and the Mass Production Tool in combination with Xactimate, Property

¹ The Accused Products are defined as Defendants' Xactimate in combination with Aerial Sketch version 2; Property InSight; Roof InSight; and the Mass Production Tool in combination with Xactimate, Property InSight, and Roof InSight.

InSight, and Roof InSight are alleged to infringe the '840, '376, '454, '770, and '737 patents.

7. The Accused Products are used to generate roof estimate reports and data packages, including Roof Insight, Property Insight and Aerial Sketch reports and data packages.
8. Xactware's Aerial Sketch version 2 was released in February 2012; its Roof InSight product was first sold in April 2012; and its Property InSight product was first sold in January 2015.
9. In the Mass Production Tool, changes to certain parameters or measurements of a roof, such as length, can impact roof pitch. The Mass Production Tool can display an aerial image of a building having a roof, and can also display two aerial images of a building with a roof at the same time.
10. In the Mass Production Tool, the [REDACTED] files are each compiled, and the resulting code is included in the application; discrete portions of such code may, under certain circumstances, be executed depending on what functions the user selects or uses, among other variables and factors.
11. Users of the Mass Production Tool can upload a model of a property in a Sketch format to Defendants' data centers in the United States.
12. Mass Production Tool version 3.14.0 has many features and functionality in common with other versions of the Mass Production Tool.
13. Finalized Property InSight data packages and Roof InSight data packages are delivered to customers or other end-users and enable such customers or end-users to create a PDF report.
14. Aerial Sketch can display an aerial image of a building having a roof, includes graphical user interface components that can be manipulated by the user, and includes a Set Slope

Tool mode of operation. The Set Slope Tool functionality gives the user the ability to estimate the slope of a roof from an oblique (non-overhead) image. And a user can click and drag a ridge point to set the slope of a roof ridge line's adjacent faces. Three-dimensional models of roofs in a Sketch format are a part of what is used in the creation of Property InSight data packages.

15. Third parties, such as end users, of Aerial Sketch can cause Aerial Sketch to display, one after the other, separately, different images of a building with a roof.
16. In Aerial Sketch, the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] are each compiled, and the resulting code is included in the application; discrete portions of such code may, under certain circumstances, be executed depending on what functions the user selects or uses, among other variables and factors.
17. Xactware has used the Mass Production Tool and Aerial Sketch in the United States at least once.
18. Xactware has generated a Property InSight data package and a Roof InSight data package in the United States at least once.
19. Xactware, without authority, supplies or causes to be supplied from the United States the Mass Production Tool and aerial images which are each a substantial portion of the components of the Accused Products claimed by the '436, '840, '376, and '737 patents, where such components are uncombined in whole or in part, in such a manner as to actively induce the combination of such components outside of the United States in a manner that would infringe the patent if such combination occurred within the United States. The Mass Production Tool is supplied by Defendants' servers in the United States, and is a software component that is executed on computer systems and constitutes a substantial component

of a roof estimation system that is combined outside of the United States in a way that would infringe the asserted patents if the combination had occurred within the United States. Aerial images used with the Mass Production Tool are components that are supplied by Defendants' servers in the United States, are substantial components of a roof estimation system, and are combined with the Mass Production Tool outside of the United States in a way that would infringe the asserted patents if the combination had occurred within the United States.

20. Xactware, without authority, supplies or causes to be supplied, the Mass Production Tool and aerial images in or from the United States, which are each a component of the patented inventions that is especially made or especially adapted for use in the claimed inventions in the '436, '840, '376, and '737 patents, and is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use, uncombined in whole or in part, knowing that the Mass Production Tool and aerial images are so made or adapted and intending that the Mass Production Tool and aerial images will be combined outside of the United States in a manner that would infringe the patent if such combination occurred within the United States. The Mass Production Tool and the aerial images used in the Mass Production Tool are supplied by Defendants' servers in the United States, were especially made and especially adapted for use in a roof estimation system, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.
21. Geomni has entered into an agreement with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Employees of this company have used the Mass Production Tool and aerial images outside the United States.

22. Xactware has entered into agreements with [REDACTED]. Employees of these [REDACTED] companies have used the Mass Production Tool and aerial images outside the United States.
23. Xactware, Geomni, and their customers, without authority, imports into the United States or offers to sell, sells, or uses within the United States the Accused Products, which are made by the processes and methods of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents. The Accused Products are tangible products sold to customers that are not materially changed by subsequent processes or trivial and nonessential components of another product. Defendants' Property InSight and Roof InSight roof reports are products made by processes patented in the United States, and no material change occurs to the product after it is made. By directing employees of companies Xactware and Geomni have entered into agreements with on how and when to use the Mass Production Tool, Xactware and Geomni induce them to perform each step of the methods or processes of the patented inventions in generating the roof reports.

B. Indirect Infringement

24. Xactware has knowingly induced and continues to knowingly induce its customers' direct infringement of Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 patent, Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent, Claim 12 of the '770 patent, Claim 26 of the '454 patent, Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 patent, and Claim 25 of the '737 patent, including through Xactware's customers' unauthorized use of Aerial Sketch, Roof Insight, and Property Insight, including by, *inter alia*, being involved in and maintaining control over the development, support, marketing, sale, and distribution of the Accused Products.
25. Xactware has had knowledge of the Asserted Patents and has intended to encourage its customers to use the Accused Products to infringe the Asserted Patents.

26. Xactware induced its customers to infringe the Asserted Patents by intentionally encouraging and continuing to encourage its customers to use Aerial Sketch—by, among other things, providing customers with user guides, manuals, instructional videos, and webcasts that include instructions on how to use Aerial Sketch in a way that infringes at least the Asserted Claims of the '840, '376, '454, '770, and '737 patents—and knew that encouraging customers to use Aerial Sketch, in combination with the Xactimate platform, would induce its customers to infringe the Asserted Patents.
27. Xactware specifically intended for its users to infringe the Asserted Patents because it knew that its encouragement and instructions provided to customers would cause those customers to use Aerial Sketch in a manner that infringes the Asserted Patents.
28. Xactware's customers follow Xactware's instructions to use Aerial Sketch to create roof reports in a manner that infringes the Asserted Patents.
29. By using Aerial Sketch in combination with the Xactimate platform, Xactware's customers directly infringe the Asserted Patents.
30. Xactware induced its customers to infringe the Asserted Patents by intentionally encouraging and continuing to encourage its customers to use its Roof InSight and Property InSight products—by, among other things, providing customers with webcasts, literature, and certifications that include instructions on how to order and use Roof InSight and Property InSight products in a way that infringes the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents—and knew that encouraging customers to use its Roof InSight and Property InSight products would induce its customers to infringe the Asserted Patents.
31. Xactware specifically intended for its users to infringe the Asserted Patents because it knew that its encouragement and instructions provided to customers would cause those customers

to use the Roof InSight and Property InSight products in a manner that infringes the Asserted Patents.

32. Xactware's customers follow Xactware's instructions to use the Roof InSight and Property InSight products in a manner that infringes the Asserted Patents.
33. By using the Roof InSight and Property InSight products, Xactware's customers directly infringe the Asserted Patents.
34. Verisk has knowingly induced and continues to knowingly induce Xactware's direct infringement of Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 patent, Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent, Claim 12 of the '770 patent, Claim 26 of the '454 patent, Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 patent, and Claim 25 of the '737 patent, including through Xactware's manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale or importation of such products in a manner that infringes the Asserted Patents, including by, *inter alia*, being involved in and maintaining control over the development, support, marketing, sale, use, and distribution of the Accused Products.
35. Verisk has had knowledge of the Asserted Patents and knew that its intentional involvement in and control over the development, use, support, marketing, sale, and distribution of the Accused Products would encourage Xactware and Xactware's customers to infringe the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents and has intended that result to occur.
36. Verisk induced Xactware to infringe the Asserted Patents by, *inter alia*, intentionally encouraging and aiding Xactware's development, use, marketing and selling of the Accused Products. Verisk actively marketed and promoted the Accused Products through its own website, procured aerial images to be used in the Accused Products, took actions

to broaden Xactware's customer base, and actively encouraged Xactware's development and use of the Accused Products in a manner that infringed the Asserted Patents.

37. Verisk specifically intended for Xactware to infringe the Asserted Patents because it knew that its encouragement and aid provided to Xactware, including through at least its involvement in and control over the development, support, sale, and distribution of the Accused Products, would cause Xactware to make and use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes the Asserted Claims of each Asserted Patent.
38. Verisk, Xactware, and Geomni provide customer support for those who use their products as necessary, including customers located in the United States.
39. By making, using, offering for sale, selling, and importing the Accused Products, Xactware directly infringes the Asserted Patents.

C. Willful Infringement

40. Xactware's infringement of the Asserted Patents has been and continues to be willful. Xactware has acted with knowledge of the Asserted Patents and without a reasonable basis for a good faith belief that it would not be liable for infringement of the Asserted Patents.
41. Defendants were aware of the scope and coverage of EagleView's Asserted Patents while Defendants developed the infringing Accused Products.
42. EagleView repeatedly notified Defendants of their infringement of, among other things, the Asserted Patents, and Defendants acknowledged the risk of infringement, but chose to proceed with their infringing activities.
43. Xactware made no attempts and no plans to design around or otherwise avoid infringement of the Asserted Patents.
44. Verisk made no attempts and no plans to design around or otherwise avoid infringement of the Asserted Patents.

45. All of the Asserted Claims have been or are being infringed by Defendants—and Defendants are liable for the infringement of any of the Asserted Claims—at least in view of the reasons set forth in the report of Plaintiff’s expert that were presented during this case and in view of the deposition testimony of Plaintiff’s expert from this case.

D. EagleView’s Technology

46. EagleView has two software tools, Render House and Twister, both of which independently embody the inventions of the Asserted Patents.
47. Render House and Twister, including the House Report functionality, are used to generate EagleView’s roof estimate reports.
48. Chris Pershing conceived of the inventions of the ’436, ’840, and ’376 patents at least as early as December 2, 2006 and reduced them to practice at least as early as January 2008.
49. Chris Pershing conceived of the inventions of the ’454, ’770, and ’737 patents at least as early as March 12, 2007 and reduced them to practice at least as early as January 2008.
50. At least as early as January 5, 2008, Chris Pershing and EagleView finished developing the Render House software which embodies the inventions of the Asserted Patents.
51. At least as early as October 15, 2008, Chris Pershing and EagleView finished developing the Twister software which incorporated all of the functionality of Render House and added features providing additional information for its roof models, which also embodies the inventions of the Asserted Patents.
52. Before this lawsuit, Defendants publicly lauded EagleView’s technologies. When Xactware discovered EagleView, it praised EagleView’s the inventions in the Asserted Patents. Subsequently, Defendants consistently lauded the patented inventions of EagleView’s Asserted Patents in various settings, including in their internal communications, in press releases, and on investor conference calls.

- 53. EagleView's claimed inventions set forth new and radically different computerized approaches to specific aspects of roof estimation than were previously thought to be possible, increasing accuracy, reducing risk, and saving resources, among other benefits.
- 54. A person of ordinary skill in the art pertinent to the Asserted Patents is "someone with a bachelor's degree or higher in computer science, computer engineering, computer vision or visualization, physics, or an equivalent educational background, or someone having at least 5 years of industry experience in software development."
- 55. All of the Asserted Claims are valid at least in view of the reasons set forth in the report of Plaintiff's expert presented during this case and in view of the deposition testimony of Plaintiff's expert from this case.

E. The '436 Patent

- 56. The '436 patent is valid and enforceable.
- 57. The '436 patent was issued by the United States Patent and trademark Office ("USPTO" or "PTO") on December 13, 2011.
- 58. Defendants had notice of the '436 patent at least as early as May 22, 2012.
- 59. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are supported by the disclosures of the '436 patent's parent applications, Application No. 12/148,439, filed on April 17, 2008, and Provisional Application No. 60,925,072, filed on April 17, 2007, and are entitled to their earlier priority dates.
- 60. No combinations of any references previously disclosed by Defendants anticipate or render the asserted claims of the '436 patent obvious.
- 61. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content based on correlating non-stereoscopic aerial images by receiving an indication of pairs of corresponding features.

All asserted claims of the '436 patent require correlating the two or more unique images.

This claims a specific approach tailored to roof modeling.

62. The '436 patent improves the prior art computer systems by adding specific techniques never before used to solve the weaknesses in the prior art recognized by the inventors.
63. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over publication by Hsieh, entitled "Design and Evaluation of a Semi-Automated Site Modeling System," Carnegie Mellon, November 1995 ("Hsieh").
64. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Hsieh in combination with publication by Applicad, entitled "Product Bulletin – November 2002: Key features of our Roofing Software," November 2002 ("Applicad").
65. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Hsieh in combination with European Patent No. 1 010 966 to Aerowest GmbH, entitled "Verfahren zur Erzeugung einer drei-dimensionalen Objektbeschreibung" [Method for generating a three-dimensional object description], issued Oct. 23, 2002 ("Aerowest").
66. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over publication entitled "Chapter 9, Feature Extraction and Object Recognition, Automatic Cartographic Feature Extraction Using Photogrammetric Principles," by D. McKeown, Jr., *et al.* in Digital Photogrammetry: An Addendum to the Manual of Photogrammetry; Published by American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (1996) ("McKeown").
67. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over McKeown in combination with AppliCad.
68. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over McKeown in combination with Aerowest.

69. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over publication by Avrahami *et al.*, entitled "Extraction of 3D Spatial Polygons Based on the Overlapping Criterion for Roof Extraction from Aerial Images," International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, August 29-30, 2005 ("Avrahami").
70. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Avrahami in combination with AppliCad.
71. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Avrahami in combination with Aerowest.
72. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over U.S. Patent No. 8,417,061 entitled "Methods and Systems for Provisioning Energy Systems," which issued on April 9, 2013 ("Sungevity").
73. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Sungevity in combination with AppliCad.
74. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Sungevity in combination with Aerowest.
75. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over publication entitled "Robust Techniques for Estimating Parameters of 3D Building Primitives" by Thomas Läbe and Eberhard Gülch, International Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Volume XXXII, Part 2, Commission II, Proceedings of the Commission II Symposium, Data Integration: Systems and Techniques, July 13-17, 1998 (1998) ("Labe").
76. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Labe in combination with AppliCad.

77. The asserted claims of the '436 patent are not obvious over Labe in combination with Aerowest.

F. The '840 Patent

78. The '840 patent is valid and enforceable.
79. Defendants had notice of the '840 patent at least as early as May 22, 2012.
80. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are supported by the disclosures of the '840 patent's parent application, Provisional Application No. 61/197,904, filed on October 31, 2008, and are entitled to its earlier priority date.
81. No combinations of any references previously disclosed by Defendants anticipate or render the asserted claims of the '840 patent obvious.
82. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report through user manipulation of an interactive graphical interface tool that is overlaid on aerial roof images or shown in the same graphical user interface as the images. The pitch determination marker ("PDM") requirements are specific and concrete. The PDM is an important advancement that improves computer-based roof modeling systems by using the PDM user interface tool.
83. The '840 patent improves the prior art computer systems by adding specific techniques never before used to solve the weaknesses in the prior art recognized by the inventor. One way in which the '840 patent improves prior art technologies, among others, is by employing a "pitch determination marker" that is "overlaid on the aerial image of the building having the roof." Employing a pitch determination marker improves upon the limitations of prior solutions at least by allowing a user to determine the elements and measurements of a roof by using one or more aerial images of a roof, without the need to climb on a physical roof.

84. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are neither anticipated by, nor obvious over, Sungevity.
85. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are neither anticipated by, nor obvious over, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0061566 to Verma, entitled "Method and Apparatus for Performing Three-Dimensional Computer Modeling," published Mar. 23, 2006 ("Verma").
86. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Hsieh either alone or in view of Verma.
87. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Labe either alone or in view of Verma.
88. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Aerowest either alone or in view of Verma.
89. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Hsieh in view of Verma, and in further view of AppliCad.
90. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Hsieh in view of Verma, and in further view of Aerowest.
91. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Labe in view of Verma, and in further view of AppliCad.
92. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Labe in view of Verma, and in further view of Aerowest.
93. The asserted claims of the '840 patent are not obvious over Verma in view of AppliCad.
94. Claim 18 of the '840 patent is not obvious over Sungevity in view of AppliCad.
95. Claim 18 of the '840 patent is not obvious over Sungevity in view of Aerowest.

G. The '376 Patent

96. The '376 patent is valid and enforceable.
97. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are supported by the disclosures of the '376 patent's parent application, Provisional Application No. 61/197,904, filed on October 31, 2008, and are entitled to its earlier priority date.
98. No combinations of any references previously disclosed by Defendants anticipate or render the asserted claims of the '376 patent obvious.
99. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report through user manipulation of an interactive graphical interface tool that is overlaid on aerial roof images or shown in the same graphical user interface as the images. The pitch determination marker ("PDM") requirements are specific and concrete. The PDM is an important advancement that improves computer-based roof modeling systems by using the PDM user interface tool.
100. The '376 patent improves the prior art computer systems by adding specific techniques never before used to solve the weaknesses in the prior art recognized by the inventor. One way in which the '376 patent improves prior art technologies, among others, is by employing a "pitch determination marker" that is "overlaid on the aerial image of the building having the roof." Employing a pitch determination marker improves upon the limitations of prior solutions at least by allowing a user to determine the elements and measurements of a roof using one or more aerial images of a roof, without the need to climb on a physical roof.
101. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are not obvious over Aerowest in view of Verma.
102. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are not obvious over Hsieh in view of Verma, and further in view of AppliCad.

103. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are not obvious over Hsieh in view of Verma, and further in view of Aerowest.
104. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are not obvious over Labe in view of Verma, and further in view of AppliCad.
105. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are not obvious over Labe in view of Verma, and further in view of Aerowest.
106. Claim 17 of the '376 patent is not obvious over Verma in view of AppliCad.
107. Claims 17 and 20 of the '376 patent are not anticipated by Sungevity.
108. The asserted claims of the '376 patent are not obvious over Sungevity in view of AppliCad and/or Aerowest.
109. Claim 23 of the '376 patent is not obvious over Sungevity in view of Verma.
110. Claim 23 of the '376 patent is not obvious over Sungevity in view of Verma, and in further view of AppliCad.
111. Claim 23 of the '376 patent is not obvious over Sungevity in view of Verma, and in further view of Aerowest.

H. The '454 Patent

112. The '454 patent is valid and enforceable.
113. Defendants had notice of the '454 patent at least as early as December 2014.
114. No combinations of any references previously disclosed by Defendants anticipate or render the asserted claims of the '454 patent obvious.
115. The asserted claims of the '454 patent are directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content by employing improved user feedback when the user manipulates an interactive graphical interface tool overlaid on aerial roof images.

116. Embodiments of the '454 patent describe a system and method that improve upon the limitations of prior solutions at least by allowing a user to determine the elements and measurements of a roof without the need to climb on a physical roof using two or more aerial images of a roof. In particular, one embodiment teaches that features of a roof can be determined by displaying corresponding changes to line drawings over two aerial images concurrently on one display.
117. The '454 patent improves the prior art computer systems by adding specific techniques never before used to solve the weaknesses in the prior art recognized by the inventors.
118. The asserted claims of the '454 patent are not obvious over Labe, either alone, or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.
119. The asserted claims of the '454 patent are not obvious over Avrahami, either alone, or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.
120. The asserted claims of the '454 patent are not obvious over Hsieh, either alone, or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.
121. The asserted claims of the '454 patent are not obvious over McKeown, either alone, or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.

I. The '770 Patent

122. The '770 patent is valid and enforceable.
123. Defendants had notice of the '770 patent at least as early as December 2014.
124. No combinations of any references previously disclosed by Defendants anticipate or render the asserted claims of the '770 patent obvious.
125. The asserted claims of the '770 patent are directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content by employing improved user

feedback while the user manipulates an interactive graphical interface tool in the same display window as aerial roof images.

126. Embodiments of the '770 patent describe a system and method that improve upon the limitations of prior solutions at least by allowing a user to determine the elements and measurements of a roof without the need to climb on a physical roof using two or more aerial images of a roof. In particular, one embodiment teaches that features of a roof can be determined by displaying corresponding changes to visual markers over two aerial images concurrently.
127. The '770 patent improves the prior art computer systems by adding specific techniques never before used to solve the weaknesses in the prior art recognized by the inventors.
128. The asserted claims of the '770 patent are not obvious over Hsieh, either alone, or in view of AppliCad.
129. The asserted claims of the '770 patent are not obvious over Avrahami, either alone, or in view of AppliCad.
130. The asserted claims of the '770 patent are not obvious over McKeown, either alone, or in view of AppliCad.

J. The '737 Patent

131. The '737 patent is valid and enforceable.
132. No combinations of any references previously disclosed by Defendants anticipate or render the asserted claims of the '737 patent obvious.
133. The asserted claims of the '737 patent are directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content by employing improved user feedback while the user manipulates an interactive graphical interface tool overlaid on aerial roof images.

134. Embodiments of the '737 patent describe a system and method that improve upon the limitations of prior solutions at least by allowing a user to determine the elements and measurements of a roof without the need to climb on a physical roof using two or more aerial images of a roof. In particular, one embodiment teaches that features of a roof can be determined by displaying corresponding changes to line drawings over two aerial images concurrently.
135. The '737 patent improves the prior art computer systems by adding specific techniques never before used to solve the weaknesses in the prior art recognized by the inventors.
136. The asserted claims of the '737 patent are not obvious over Labe, either alone or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.
137. The asserted claims of the '737 patent are not obvious over Hsieh, either alone or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.
138. The asserted claims of the '737 patent are not obvious over Avrahami, either alone or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.
139. The asserted claims of the '737 patent are not obvious over McKeown, either alone or in view of AppliCad or Aerowest.

K. The Sungevity Patent

140. In addition to failing to disclose the claim elements of the asserted claims of the '436, '840, and '376 patents against which Defendants have asserted the Sungevity patent, the Sungevity patent is not prior art to the '436, '840, and '376 patents.
141. The Sungevity patent claims priority to Provisional Application No. 61/047,086 ("086 provisional"), filed on April 22, 2008, and Provisional Application No. 61/025,431 ("431 provisional"), filed on February 1, 2008; however, the Sungevity patent's allegedly invalidating claims and disclosures are not supported by the disclosures in either of its

provisional applications, and it is not entitled to the earlier priority dates of those applications.

- 142. The '436 patent has a priority date at least as early as October 16, 2008.
- 143. The Sungevity patent is not prior art to the '436 patent because the application for the Sungevity patent was filed on February 2, 2009, later than the '436 patent's October 16, 2008 filing date.
- 144. The '840 and '376 patents are entitled to the priority date of Provisional Application No. 61/197,904, filed on October 31, 2008.
- 145. The Sungevity patent is not prior art to the '840 and '376 patents because the application for the Sungevity patent was filed on February 2, 2009, later than the '840 and '376 patents' October 31, 2008 priority date.

L. OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS

- 146. Xactware and Verisk copied EagleView's technology when developing Aerial Sketch and the Mass Production Tool. Defendants developed an extensive working knowledge of EagleView's patented technology of the Asserted Patents through the course of its partnership with, and due diligence of, EagleView. A number of Defendants' engineers and managers conducting diligence of and interacting with Eagle View's technology—including the EagleView products that embody the Asserted Claims—also worked on and developed the Accused Products. Despite their exposure to EagleView's technology embodying the Asserted Patents, Defendants made no effort to ensure that these same engineers were separated from Defendants' own development of an image-based roof measurement product (*e.g.*, establishing "clean rooms" during the course of development). Defendants used its extensive knowledge of EagleView's patented technology of the Asserted Patents to develop the Accused Products.

147. Xactware engineers and representatives visited EagleView's facilities in early 2009 to tour the production floor and meet with EagleView's executives. These engineers and representatives included at least Jeffrey Taylor, Jeffrey Lewis, and Brad Childs. The agenda for this visit included time allotted for a presentation of Eagle View's operations and technical workflow, image sample review, technical questions, and a tour of Eagle View's operations. Also, during this visit, Defendants' executive [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], which EagleView considered confidential and which relate to the claimed limitations of the Asserted Patents.
148. Jeffrey Lewis and Jeffrey Taylor were involved in the development of the Mass Production Tool and the development of the Aerial Sketch program.
149. Due to the inventions of the Asserted Patents, EagleView's products have been commercially successful, garnered widespread industry praise, and became the industry standard for aerial roof estimation.
150. Eagle View's patented technology was initially met with industry skepticism, but as customers confirmed the accuracy of Eagle View reports, the technology began to experience widespread industry praise.
151. EagleView's patented roof estimation method solved a long felt industry need by enabling roof measurements to be taken remotely with aerial images.
- II. Plaintiff intends to prove the following contested facts with regard to damages:
152. EagleView is entitled to damages beginning on the date of first infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 286 and 287.

A. LOST PROFITS

153. EagleView lost profits due to Defendants' infringement on sales to the insurance industry (excluding price erosion) of at least [REDACTED] and to contractors (excluding price erosion) of at least [REDACTED] from the time of Defendants' first infringement in February 2012 through January 2018.
154. Xactware's infringing sales also caused prices to erode substantially between 2012 and the present, causing EagleView to lose an additional [REDACTED] on sales to the insurance industry, and an additional [REDACTED] on sales to contractors.
155. Total profits lost by EagleView due to Defendants' infringement on sales to the insurance industry of [REDACTED] and to contractors of [REDACTED], for total lost profits due to Defendants' infringement of [REDACTED].
156. Demand for EagleView's products that embody the Asserted Patents consistently rose, as evidenced by rising sales of both EagleView's and Defendants' products. EagleView and Defendants compete with one another in the same geographic area (*i.e.*, the United States and Canada). Aerial rooftop measurement products constitute their own market. Xactware was unable to compete in the aerial rooftop measurement products market until it began using EagleView's patented technology.
157. Before Defendants' infringement, EagleView was the only company capable of generating commercially acceptable roof models and reports based solely on aerial imagery.
158. EagleView has lost both sales and insurance and contractor customers to Xactware, including [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].
159. Xactware entered into contracts with many of EagleView's former and current customers, including [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED], for the use of the Accused Products

160. EagleView also employed other tactics to turn customers away from EagleView and towards the Accused Products.
161. Xactware has had no non-infringing substitute on the market during the infringing period, and no non-infringing alternatives have existed during the relevant damages period.
162. EagleView has always been able to supply roof report orders and has steadily increased in production capacity in response to actual and anticipated increases in order flow.
163. Other than price, customers do not appear to recognize a difference between Defendants' Accused Products and EagleView's products embodying the Asserted Patents. Several former EagleView customers admitted that Xactware's offering of lower prices for the Accused Products, among other price-focused sales tactics, were the reason the customers switched from EagleView to Xactware.

B. REASONABLE ROYALTY

164. To the extent that EagleView is not entitled to lost profits, a reasonable royalty would be between [REDACTED], and in no event below [REDACTED] through January 2018.

C. QUANTIFIABLE BENEFITS

165. Prior to EagleView's innovations, generating roof measurement reports required on-sight assessments. Such in-person assessments often involved either climbing on rooftops to take measurements, or making estimates from the ground, both of which were costly and error-prone. EagleView's patented technology enables more accurate roof measurement information than previously possible.
166. The patented inventions permit the production of roof reports (i) with greater accuracy, (ii) with more efficiency, and (iii) without the risk of physical harm associated with the traditional preparation of roof reports. One study estimated that the cost-savings from using EagleView's patented technology was approximately \$549/report.
167. The Accused Products are integral to Defendants' businesses and have been central to Defendants' growth. And sales of the Accused Products increased overall sales at Xactware.
168. Defendants' Accused Products do not include any significant features or improvements, or an economically meaningful non-patented element or manufacturing process.
169. EagleView's rooftop reports are highly profitable—between 2013 and February 2018, its marginal profit ranged from [REDACTED] of revenue. Between 2013 and 2017, EagleView expanded its annual sales of roof reports from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED].
170. EagleView does not license (and has never licensed) the Asserted Patents.
171. Using the Price-Differential model, royalty for Aerial Sketch is calculated to be \$[REDACTED], by subtracting the price of non-accused Aerial Sketch v.1 (\$[REDACTED]) from the price of accused Aerial Sketch v.2 (\$[REDACTED]).
172. Using the Cost-Savings model, EagleView's patented technology saved an average of \$549/report to determine the quantifiable benefits of EagleView's patented technology.

The study also found that EagleView's patented technology saved 28 minutes (Aerial Sketch v.2) to 36 minutes (EagleView's Premium Report, Roof InSight, Property InSight) over manual measurement, which amounted to savings of \$14.88 and \$19.13, respectively and reduced to \$14.13 to account for Defendants' incremental costs in time-savings per roof.

173. Using the Incremental-Profits model, three royalties are calculated based on one aspect of the Asserted Claims: the roof report generated and transmitted using EagleView's patented technology. These royalties through January 2018 are (i) [REDACTED], based on EagleView's lost roof-report profits to insurers and contractors; (ii) [REDACTED], based on Defendants' 2013–2014 Roof InSight per-report pricing of [REDACTED] less incremental costs ([REDACTED]) and the [REDACTED] royalty for Aerial Sketch ([REDACTED]); and (iii) [REDACTED], based on Defendants' discounted Roof InSight price of [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and the [REDACTED] royalty for Aerial Sketch ([REDACTED]).

D. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

174. EagleView has suffered an irreparable injury, and remedies available at law are inadequate to compensate for EagleView's injury.
175. Defendants' infringing sales of the Accused Products have resulted in irreparable harm to EagleView, and monetary damages alone would be inadequate.
176. Xactware's infringing sales have eroded EagleView's prices, caused EagleView to lose customers, and caused EagleView to lose market share.
177. All of the major customers are aware of Xactware's presence in the market and have sought (or are expected to seek) price reductions based on Xactware's market presence.
178. EagleView and the Defendants are the only competitors in the market.

179. Continued sales by Xactware serve to prolong and/or exacerbate price erosion of EagleView's products and cause EagleView to lose more customers and market share for an unknown and unknowable period of time into the future.
180. The balance of hardships favors entry of an injunction when considering, among other things, the products and revenue sources. The patented technology of the Asserted Patents is central to EagleView's business, and EagleView's market share, revenue, and business strategy depend on its ability to exclude others from using its patents. EagleView directly competes with Defendants, and Defendants' infringement has caused EagleView to lose market share. And Defendants' continued infringement will cause EagleView to lose more market share in the future. EagleView should not need to compete against its own patented invention, and Defendants will not be harmed by stopping their unlawful infringement.
181. The public interest favors entry of a permanent injunction because a permanent injunction would protect EagleView's patent rights, and EagleView has the capacity to fulfill all sales of the Accused Products and satisfy the relevant markets if Defendants are permanently enjoined from future development, manufacture and sale of the Accused Products.

PART IV. DEFENDANTS' CONTESTED FACTS:

Procedural history:

1. Plaintiffs EagleView Technologies, Inc. and Pictometry International Corp. filed a complaint on September 23, 2015, alleging that:
 - U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436 (the “436 patent”) is infringed by Xactimate in combination with Roof Insight and/or Property Insight;
 - U.S. Patent Nos. 8,170,840 (the “840 patent”), 8,209,152 (the “152 patent”), 8,825,454 (the “454 patent”), 8,818,770 (the “770 patent”), and 8,823,732 (the “732 patent”) are infringed by Xactimate in combination with Aerial Sketch; and
 - U.S. Patent No. 8,532,880 (“880 patent”) is infringed by Xactimate in combination with Roof Insight and/or Aerial Sketch.

Dkt. 1.

2. Defendants answered Plaintiffs’ complaint on November 12, 2015, denying infringement of any of the ‘436, ‘840, ‘152, ‘880, ‘770, ‘732 and ‘454 patents and alleging that these patents are invalid. Dkt. No. 15. Defendants asserted counterclaims seeking declaratory judgments of non-infringement and invalidity with respect to all seven of these asserted patents. *Id.*
3. Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on November 30, 2015, adding allegations of infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,129,376 (the “376 patent”) and 9,135,737 (the “737 patent”) by Xactimate in combination with Aerial Sketch. Dkt. No. 30. Plaintiffs contended that Defendants infringed a total of 153 claims spanning these nine asserted patents.
4. Defendants answered Plaintiffs’ amended complaint on May 18, 2017, denying that the Accused Products have infringed any of the ‘436, ‘840, ‘152, ‘880, ‘770, ‘732, ‘454, ‘376 and ‘737 patents and alleging that these patents are invalid. Dkt. No. 238. Defendants asserted counterclaims seeking declaratory judgments of non-infringement and invalidity with respect to all nine of these asserted patents. *Id.*
5. On May 18, 2017, EagleView narrowed its infringement allegations to 24 claims spanning the ‘436, ‘840, ‘152, ‘770, ‘454, ‘376 and ‘737 patents. Dkt. 239. In doing so, EagleView confirmed that the ‘880 patent and the ‘732 patent no longer would be asserted in this case. *Id.*
6. On May 18, 2008, following the exchange of opening expert reports – including the exchange of EagleView’s expert report concerning damages – but before the conclusion of expert discovery, EagleView further narrowed its infringement contentions by removing six additional patent claims from the case.
7. On August 1, 2018, in response to this Court’s order (Dkt. No. 449), EagleView further narrowed its infringement contentions by removing seven additional patent claims from

the case. In doing so, EagleView confirmed that the '152 patent no longer would be asserted in this case.

Defendants intend to prove the following contested facts with regard to liability:

8. It is impossible to infringe a patent that has not yet issued.
9. None of the Asserted Patents in this case, in their current form, had issued in or before April 2012.
10. The earliest date of issuance of any patent asserted in this case, in its current form, was May 1, 2012.
11. Xactware Solutions, Inc. ("Xactware") has not and currently does not directly infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
12. Xactware and Verisk Analytics, Inc. ("Verisk") (collectively, the "Defendants") have not and currently do not directly or indirectly infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
13. The Defendants have not and currently do not induce infringement, knowingly or otherwise, of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
14. Xactware has not and currently does not infringe any Asserted Claim of the '436 patent, the '840 patent or the '376 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1) or (2).
15. Xactware has not and currently does not infringe, knowingly or otherwise, any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g).
16. Performance of any Asserted Claim, including method claims, by third parties, such as an end user, does not constitute direct or indirect infringement by either of the Defendants.
17. None of Aerial Sketch, Roof InSight, Property InSight, the Mass Production Tool, or Xactimate individually, nor any combination of them ("Accused Products"), infringes, directly or indirectly, any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
18. The accused Xactimate platform was commercially available prior to the earliest priority date of any Asserted Patent. Xactimate, by itself, does not infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
19. Roof InSight, Property InSight, the Mass Production Tool, and Aerial Sketch do not individually infringe any Asserted Claim.
20. Roof InSight, Property InSight, the Mass Production Tool, and Aerial Sketch are not alleged to infringe any Asserted Claim except in combination with Xactimate.
21. Any alleged notification by EagleView of supposed patent infringement by Defendants that occurred prior to May 1, 2012 does not constitute notice of alleged infringement of

any currently Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent, because no currently Asserted Claim existed prior to May 1, 2012.

22. By using the Accused Products, end-users do not infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
23. Aerial Sketch is primarily used by third-party end users who are not under the direction or control of either of the Defendants.
24. Neither Defendant, nor any Accused Product, employs, builds, sells, or otherwise uses a distributed-memory computer system or architecture.
25. The Accused Products employ a fundamentally different approach to generating roof models and reports than what is disclosed or claimed in any of the Asserted Patents.
26. The Accused Products do not correlate aerial images as claimed in the Asserted Claims.
27. The Accused Products do not constitute, contain, or comprise computer executable instructions stored on memory for performing correlation of aerial images or generation of three dimensional models based on any such correlation, as claimed in the Asserted Claims.
28. The Roof Insight/Property Insight system, including the Mass Production Tool, is a distributed system with components that are stored in and executed at multiple locations throughout the world.
29. The Accused Products are multi-component software, and cannot infringe, directly or indirectly, any claim directed to a “roof estimation module.”
30. The Accused Products lack a “roof estimation module” as recited by the Asserted Claims.
31. The Accused Products do not generate a three-dimensional model as required by the Asserted Claims of the ’436 patent.
32. The Accused Products do not contain a “memory” as recited by the Asserted System Claims.
33. The Accused Products do not generate a three-dimensional model based on a correlation, as required by the Asserted Claims of the ’436 patent.
34. The Accused Products do not generate three-dimensional models by mapping ground points.
35. The Accused Products do not generate three-dimensional models by aerotriangulation.
36. The Accused Products do not generate three-dimensional models by identifying corresponding features from displayed roof elements.

37. The Accused Products do not receive, based on a displayed pitch determination marker, an indication of the pitch of one or more planar roof sections, as required by the Asserted Claims of the '840 patent.
38. The Accused Products do not modify a model of the roof based on the received indication of the pitch of the one planar roof section, as required by the Asserted Claims of the '840 patent.
39. The Accused Products do not use any "pitch determination marker," as required by the Asserted Claims of the '840 and '376 patents.
40. The Accused Products do not transmit any roof estimate report, as required by the Asserted Claims of the '840 and '436 patents.
41. There are no embodiments of the '840 or '376 patents, nor any asserted claims of these patents, where the claimed pitch determination marker and the claimed wire frame model are the same item, element, or limitation.
42. The Accused Products do not perform digital wire frame model construction of the roof structure based on at least one location over the roof structure in the displayed aerial imagery to which the user moved the least one [sic] first visual marker, as required by the Asserted Claims of the '770 patent.
43. Aerial Sketch does not display a first and second aerial image "at the same time," as required by the Asserted Claims of the '737 patent.
44. EagleView has presented no evidence that the Accused Products provide reports "for repair and/or construction," as required by the Asserted Claims of the '376 patent.
45. None of Xactimate, Roof Insight, Property Insight, the Mass Production Tool, or Aerial Sketch are "memory" as claimed in the Asserted Patents.
46. Any computer-implemented method for generating a roof estimate report by Defendants, to the extent any such method is performed at all, is practiced entirely or primarily outside of the United States.
47. Defendants' computing system for generating a roof estimate report, to the extent any such system exists at all, is neither made nor used, entirely or primarily, as claimed within the United States, nor is it offered for sale in the United States.
48. Defendants' non-transitory computer readable storage medium which performs a method of generating a roof estimate report for a building having a roof, to the extent any such medium exists at all, is neither made nor used as claimed, entirely or primarily within the United States, nor is it offered for sale in the United States.
49. Roof models, data packages, or files, such as Sketch files, generated by Defendants' overseas Business Process Outsourcing ("BPO") partners using the Mass Production Tool are materially changed by subsequent processes.

50. A roof model, data package, or file, such as a Sketch or “.skt” file, generated using the Mass Production Tool does not contain pitch or slope information.
51. A roof model, data package, or file, such as a Sketch or “.skt” file, generated by Defendants’ overseas BPO partners using the Mass Production Tool becomes a trivial and nonessential component of another product.
52. The Mass Production Tool does not constitute a component especially made, adapted, used, offered for sale, sold, and/or imported for use in any product covered by the claims of any of the Asserted Patents, and is a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.
53. The Accused Products are not products made, used, offered for sale, sold, and/or imported in accordance with EagleView’s patented process.
54. Xactware does not supply from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of Defendants’ rooftop aerial measurement products, including Xactimate, Property InSight/Roof InSight, or the Mass Production Tool.
55. The Mass Production Tool does not constitute a component that is combined outside of the United States in a way that would infringe the Asserted Patents if the combination had occurred within the United States.
56. Aerial images used with the Mass Production Tool are not combined with the Mass Production Tool outside of the United States in a way that would infringe the Asserted Patents if the combination had occurred within the United States.
57. Neither the export from or import into the United States, nor the general possession or use, foreign or domestic, of aerial images infringes, infringes or is within the scope of, any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
58. Xactware does not import into the United States, offer to sell, sell, and/or use within the United States roof report products made by Defendants’ rooftop aerial measurement products, including Xactimate, Property InSight/Roof InSight, and the Mass Production Tool.
59. Defendants’ Property InSight and Roof InSight roof reports are not products made by patented processes of the Asserted Patents.
60. Defendants do not induce overseas BPOs to perform, and such BPOs themselves do not perform, each step of the methods or processes of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent in generating roof models or roof reports.
61. Roof reports sold by Defendants are not products offered for sale or sold in the United States that are made by a method or process of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.

62. Verisk did not, could not, and does not possess any relevant knowledge or intent required for a claim of indirect infringement, particularly because Xactware's actions do not infringe, directly or otherwise, the claims of the Asserted Patents.
63. Xactware has not and does not encourage its customers or anyone else to use Aerial Sketch or any other Accused Product in a way that infringes any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
64. Xactware did not, could not, and does not possess any relevant knowledge or intent required for a claim of induced infringement, nor did it or does it encourage any infringement of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent by customers or anyone else.
65. The use of Aerial Sketch in combination with the Xactimate platform does not infringe, directly or otherwise, any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent, whether used by customers or anyone else.
66. Defendants' customers' use of the Accused Products, including Aerial Sketch, is not done at the instruction of, nor under the direction and control of, either Defendant, nor would any such use of the Accused Products infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
67. Xactware did not and does not intend, specifically or otherwise, for its customers or other users to infringe the Asserted Patents, including because such users do not, in fact, infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
68. Xactware did not and does not possess any relevant knowledge or intent required for a claim of indirect infringement under any theory, nor did it or does it encourage or provide instructions for any infringement of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent by customers or anyone else.
69. The provision of literature instructing users how to order a Roof InSight or Property InSight roof report or data package does not infringe, directly or otherwise, any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
70. The act of ordering a roof report, as well as the act of providing literature regarding how to order a roof report, is not within the scope of, recited or claimed in, or otherwise encompassed by any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
71. The act of ordering a roof report is not, by itself, claimed in any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
72. The act of purchasing a roof report is not, by itself, claimed in any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
73. The act of requesting a roof report is not, by itself, claimed in any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
74. The act of receiving a roof report is not, by itself, claimed in any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.

75. Defendants do not make, sell, or offer to sell computers or computer memory.
76. Defendants have not and do not willfully infringe, either directly or indirectly, any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent. Defendants have acted with a reasonable basis and have a good faith belief that Defendants would not be liable for infringement of the Asserted Patents.
77. Verisk and EagleView Technology Corporation signed a detailed agreement (the “Verisk Agreement”) dated January 14, 2014 pursuant to which Verisk would acquire EagleView Technology Corporation for approximately \$650 million.
78. In the Verisk Agreement, EagleView warranted and represented that Verisk and Xactware did not infringe any EagleView patents. The Verisk Agreement remained in effect from January 14, 2014 until December 16, 2014, when it was terminated because the Federal Trade Commission prohibited the proposed acquisition.
79. Vista Equity Partners (“Vista”) and EVTC signed a detailed agreement (the “Vista Agreement”) dated June 15, 2015 pursuant to which Vista would acquire EVTC [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
80. In the Vista Agreement, EVTC warranted and represented that Verisk and Xactware did not infringe any EagleView patents.
81. Defendants relied upon EagleView’s representation that Verisk and Xactware did not infringe any EagleView patents.
82. Defendants were, are, and will be prejudiced by EagleView’s infringement allegations and Eagle View’s efforts to proceed with this litigation.
83. Defendants’ development and creation of the Accused Products relied exclusively on Defendants’ own ingenuity, knowledge, technology, research, experience, and efforts, and did not involve any reliance on, emulation of, or reference to any of the Asserted Patents.
84. No proprietary source code or operational versions for any of EagleView’s Render House, Twister, or other roof estimation software programs were shared with Xactware or Verisk during the process of integrating EagleView’s roof report data packages onto the Xactimate platform.
85. The data provided by EagleView to the Xactimate platform as part of EagleView’s integration and selling of reports on the Xactimate platform does not reveal any source code or proprietary information regarding any of EagleView’s Render House, Twister, or other roof estimation software programs.
86. The required format of the data provided by EagleView to the Xactimate platform as part of EagleView’s integration and selling of reports on the Xactimate platform was dictated by Xactware.

87. Customers do not purchase, license, or use either Render House or Twister.
88. Customers have no direct access to either Render House or Twister.
89. Customers do not see the operation of and have no knowledge of the implementation details of the Render House or Twister software.
90. Simply being in the proximity of someone using EagleView's Twister or Render House software tools would not enable another to reverse engineer such software.
91. EagleView's own employees confirm that if an individual observed the operation of Render House or Twister by looking over the shoulder of an individual running either of these software programs, he or she would not be able to reverse engineer such programs.
92. EagleView's own employees believe that simply walking by a computer screen on which the Twister or Render House software program is operating would not enable them to understand the software.
93. EagleView's own employees believe that even if an individual was provided with a computer running the Twister software application, that individual would not know how to use this application to analyze images.
94. Only in or about 2017 did EagleView even begin research and development into the use of roof primitives for the purpose of generating roof models or reports.
95. Never during any visits to any EagleView offices did any employee from any Defendant see a prototype of EagleView's technology or learn how EagleView created roof reports.
96. None of the Asserted Claims have been or are being infringed, directly or indirectly, by Defendants—and Defendants are not liable for infringement, whether direct or indirect, of any of the Asserted Claims—at least in view of the reasons set forth in the reports of Defendants' experts that were presented during this case and in view of the deposition testimony of those experts from this case.

Defendants intend to prove the following contested facts with regard to invalidity:

97. All of the Asserted Claims are invalid.
98. All of the Asserted Claims are unpatentable and invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
99. All of the Asserted Claims are directed to patent-ineligible concepts.
100. For each Asserted Claim, when the elements of the claim are considered individually and as an ordered combination, there is no transformation of the nature of the claim into patent-eligible subject matter.
101. Prior to the issuance of any Asserted Patent and prior to the earliest priority date of any Asserted Patent, Xactware developed and offered commercially the ability to create

models of roofs, called Sketches, including the ability to underlay aerial images of the buildings having roofs that were the subject of such roof models.

102. Chris Pershing did not invent the math for performing the image analysis covered by the Asserted Claims of the '436 patent solely from the image data files.
103. Written computer code in the form of photogrammetric algorithms existed as generally known in the art prior to any conception of any supposed invention of Chris Pershing captured in the '436 patent.
104. Part of the supposed invention of the '436 patent is the use of existing, well-known mathematical principles from textbooks and journal articles.
105. As part of the supposed invention of the '436 patent, Chris Pershing did not invent any new programming language and, instead, used existing programing languages.
106. All entries in Chris Pershing's inventor notebooks after December 4, 2006 are entirely unverified and unauthenticated and do not sufficiently or properly evidence any conception or reduction to practice of any aspect of any supposed invention of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
107. Chris Pershing did not fully conceive of the supposed inventions of the '436, '840, or '376 Patents by December 2, 2006, and did not reduce them to practice by January 2008.
108. David Carlson did not fully conceive of the supposed inventions of the '436 Patent by December 2, 2006, and did not reduce them to practice by January 2008.
109. Chris Pershing did not fully conceive of the supposed inventions of the '454, '770, and '737 patents by March 12, 2007, and did not reduce them to practice by January 2008.
110. Chris Pershing and EagleView did not finish developing any Render House software that embodied any supposed invention of any Asserted Patent by January 5, 2008.
111. No version of the Render House software embodies any supposed invention of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
112. Chris Pershing and EagleView did not finish developing any Twister software that embodied any supposed invention of any Asserted Patent by October 15, 2008.
113. No version of the Twister software embodies any supposed invention of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
114. The purported invention of each Asserted Claim is not an improvement to technology or computer functionality.
115. None of the Asserted Claims require the use of a specialized computer, computer system, memory, or machine.

116. Each of the Asserted Claims concern the application of a generic computer to implement an abstract idea.
117. The Asserted Claims of the '436 patent are not directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content based on correlating non-stereoscopic aerial images by receiving an indication of pairs of corresponding features.
118. The '436 patent disclosure does not improve prior art computer systems.
119. The Asserted Claims of the '436 patent are not supported by the disclosures of the '436 patent's parent applications, Application No. 12/148,439, filed on April 17, 2008, or Provisional Application No. 60/925,072, filed on April 17, 2007, and are not entitled to their earlier priority dates.
120. The Asserted Claims of the '840 patent are not directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report through user manipulation of an interactive graphical interface tool that is overlaid on aerial roof images or shown in the same graphical user interface as the images.
121. The '840 patent disclosure does not improve prior art computer systems.
122. The pitch determination marker is not illustrated at all in Fig. 6B of the '840 patent, which instead depicts a drawing tool that can be directly manipulated by the operator in order to specify roof features, such as edges, ridges, valleys, corners, etc.
123. Fig. 6B of the '840 patent includes a wire frame model.
124. Column 14, lines 9-13 of the '840 patent does not discuss the use of a drawing tool to determine pitch and do not recite a pitch determination marker.
125. The Asserted Claims of the '376 patent are not directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report through user manipulation of an interactive graphical interface tool that is overlaid on aerial roof images or shown in the same graphical user interface as the images.
126. The '376 patent disclosure does not improve prior art computer systems.
127. Neither the envelope tool nor any other embodiment of the pitch determination marker is illustrated at all in Fig. 6B of the '376 patent.
128. Fig. 6B of the '376 patent includes a wire frame model.
129. The Asserted Claims of the '454 patent are not directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content by employing improved user feedback when the user manipulates an interactive graphical interface tool overlaid on aerial roof images.
130. The '454 patent disclosure does not improve prior art computer systems.

131. The Asserted Claims of the '770 patent are not directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content by employing improved user feedback while the user manipulates an interactive graphical interface tool in the same display window as aerial roof images.
132. The '770 patent disclosure does not improve prior art computer systems.
133. The Asserted Claims of the '737 patent are not directed to an improved computer system for generating a roof estimate report with specific content by employing improved user feedback while the user manipulates an interactive graphical interface tool overlaid on aerial roof images.
134. The '737 patent disclosure does not improve prior art computer systems.
135. The Asserted Claims contain subject matter that would be well understood, routine and conventional to a person of skill in the art prior to the filing of the applications that led to the Asserted Claims.
136. All of the Asserted Claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103.
137. The Twister and Render House products do not embody or practice any of the Asserted Claims.
138. There are no secondary considerations that weigh against a finding of invalidity with regard to any of the Asserted Claims.
139. There is no nexus between the secondary considerations identified by EagleView and any of the Asserted Claims.
140. Defendants have not copied Plaintiff's patented technology.
141. No employee, past or present, of either Xactware or Verisk has ever copied, stolen, inspected, or even viewed EagleView's source code for any of its Render House, Twister, or other roof estimation software programs.
142. EagleView has no evidence that anyone from Xactware or Verisk has ever stolen, copied, or otherwise obtained any EagleView source code source code for any of its Render House, Twister, or other roof estimation software programs.
143. No employee, past or present, of Xactware or Verisk has ever operated or otherwise used any of EagleView's Render House, Twister, or other roof estimation software programs.
144. Supposed praise and skepticism of EagleView's products and technology does not weigh against a finding of invalidity with regard to any of the Asserted Claims.
145. Plaintiff's supposed solution to a long felt industry need does not weigh against a finding of invalidity with regard to any of the Asserted Claims.

146. None of the Asserted Claims are entitled to claim priority to any parent application.
147. The following references are prior art to the Asserted Claims and the Asserted Patents:
 - “Hsieh,” which refers to a publication by Hsieh, entitled “Design and Evaluation of a Semi-Automated Site Modeling System,” Carnegie Mellon, November 1995
 - “McKeown,” which refers to a publication entitled “Chapter 9, Feature Extraction and Object Recognition, Automatic Cartographic Feature Extraction Using Photogrammetric Principles,” by D. McKeown, Jr., et al. in Digital Photogrammetry: An Addendum to the Manual of Photogrammetry; Published by American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (1996)
 - “Sungevity,” which refers to U.S. Patent No. 8,417,061 entitled “Methods and Systems for Provisioning Energy Systems,” which issued on April 9, 2013
 - “Avrahami,” which refers to a publication by Avrahami et al., entitled “Extraction of 3D Spatial Polygons Based on the Overlapping Criterion for Roof Extraction from Aerial Images,” International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, August 29-30, 2005
 - “Applicad,” which refers to a publication by Applicad, entitled “Product Bulletin – November 2002: Key features of our Roofing Software,” November 2002
 - “Labe,” which refers to a publication entitled “Robust Techniques for Estimating Parameters of 3D Building Primitives” by Thomas Läbe and Eberhard Gülch, International Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Volume XXXII, Part 2, Commission II, Proceedings of the Commission II Symposium, Data Integration: Systems and Techniques, July 13-17, 1998 (1998)
 - “Aerowest,” which refers to European Patent No. 1 010 966 to Aerowest GmbH, entitled “Verfahren zur Erzeugung einer drei-dimensionalen Objektbeschreibung” [Method for generating a three-dimensional object description], issued Oct. 23, 2002 and
 - “Verma,” which refers to U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0061566 to Verma, entitled “Method and Apparatus for Performing Three-Dimensional Computer Modeling,” published Mar. 23, 2006.
148. Sungevity is prior art to the ‘436 patent, the ‘840 patent, and the ‘376 patent.
149. The Sungevity patent claims priority to Provisional Application No. 61/047,086 (“’086 provisional”), filed on April 22, 2008, and Provisional Application No. 61/025,431 (“’431 provisional”), filed on February 1, 2008, such claims and corresponding disclosures are fully supported by the disclosures in those provisional applications, and the claims are entitled to the earlier priority dates of those provisional applications.

150. Sungevity's priority date precedes the earliest priority date for both the '840 patent and the '376 patent.
151. The Patent Office's conclusion that Sungevity is prior art to the '436 patent is correct.
152. The Asserted Claims of the '436 patent are obvious in view of:
 - Hsieh
 - Hsieh in combination with Applicad;
 - Hsieh in combination with Aerowest;
 - McKeown;
 - McKeown in combination with Applicad;
 - McKeown in combination with Aerowest;
 - Avrahami;
 - Avrahami in combination with Applicad;
 - Avrahami in combination with Aerowest;
 - Sungevity;
 - Sungevity in combination with Applicad;
 - Sungevity in combination with Aerowest;
 - Labe;
 - Labe in combination with Applicad; and
 - Labe in combination with Aerowest.
153. The Asserted Claims of the '840 patent are anticipated by Sungevity.
154. The Asserted Claims of the '840 patent are anticipated by Verma.
155. The Asserted Claims of the '840 patent are obvious in view of:
 - Sungevity;
 - Verma;
 - Hsieh;
 - Hsieh in combination with Verma;
 - Labe;
 - Labe in combination with Verma;
 - Aerowest;
 - Hsieh in combination with Verma and Applicad;
 - Hsieh in combination with Verma and Aerowest;
 - Labe in combination with Verma and Applicad;
 - Labe in combination with Verma and Aerowest;
 - Verma in combination with Aerowest; and
 - Verma in combination with Applicad.
156. Claim 18 of the '840 patent is obvious over Sungevity in view of Applicad.
157. Claim 18 of the '840 patent is obvious over Sungevity in view of Aerowest.
158. Claim 17 of the '376 patent is anticipated by Sungevity.

159. Claim 17 of the '376 patent is obvious in view of:

- Sungevity in combination with Applicad;
- Sungevity in combination with Aerowest;
- Verma in combination with Applicad;
- Verma in combination with Aerowest;
- Hsieh in combination Verma and Applicad;
- Hsieh in combination Verma and Aerowest;
- Labe in combination Verma and Applicad; and
- Labe in combination Verma and Aerowest.

160. Claim 20 of the '376 patent is anticipated by Sungevity.

161. Claim 20 of the '376 patent is obvious in view of:

- Sungevity in combination with Applicad;
- Sungevity in combination with Aerowest;
- Sungevity in combination with Applicad and Aerowest
- Verma in combination with Aerowest;
- Hsieh in combination with Verma and Applicad;
- Hsieh in combination with Verma and Aerowest;
- Labe in combination with Verma and Applicad; and
- Labe in combination with Verma and Aerowest.

162. Claim 23 of the '376 patent is obvious in view of:

- Sungevity in combination with Verma;
- Sungevity in combination with Verma and Applicad;
- Sungevity in combination with Verma and Aerowest;
- Sungevity in combination with Applicad;
- Sungevity in combination with Aerowest;
- Sungevity in combination with Applicad and Aerowest
- Verma in combination with Aerowest;
- Hsieh in combination with Verma and Applicad;
- Hsieh in combination with Verma and Aerowest;
- Labe in combination with Verma and Applicad; and
- Labe in combination with Verma and Aerowest.

163. The Asserted Claims of the '454 patent are obvious in view of:

- Labe;
- Labe in combination with Applicad;
- Labe in combination with Aerowest;
- Avrahami;
- Avrahami in combination with Applicad;
- Avrahami in combination with Aerowest;
- McKeown;

- McKeown in combination with Applicad;
- McKeown in combination with Aerowest;
- Hsieh;
- Hsieh in combination with Applicad; and.
- Hsieh in combination with Aerowest.

164. The Asserted Claims of the '770 patent are obvious in view of:

- Hsieh;
- Hsieh in combination with Applicad;
- Avrahami;
- Avrahami in combination with Applicad; and
- McKeown;
- McKeown in combination with Applicad.

165. The Asserted Claims of the '737 patent are obvious in view of:

- Labe;
- Labe in combination with Applicad;
- Labe in combination with Aerowest;
- Avrahami;
- Avrahami in combination with Applicad;
- Avrahami in combination with Aerowest;
- McKeown;
- McKeown in combination with Applicad;
- McKeown in combination with Aerowest;
- Hsieh;
- Hsieh in combination with Applicad; and
- Hsieh in combination with Aerowest.

166. At the priority date of each Asserted Patent, there was sufficient motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings and disclosures of the references that render each Asserted Claim obvious.

167. Hsieh is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.

168. Hsieh is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.

169. Hsieh was publicly accessible at least as early as November 1995.

170. McKeown is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.
171. McKeown is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.
172. McKeown references and builds upon Hsieh, and was published in 1996.
173. Sungevity is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.
174. Sungevity is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.
175. Avrahami is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.
176. Avrahami is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.
177. Avrahami was published in August 2005.
178. Applicad is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.
179. Applicad is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.

180. Applicad was published in November 2002.
181. Labe is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.
182. Labe is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.
183. Labe was published in July 1998.
184. Aerowest is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.
185. Aerowest is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.
186. Verma is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, prior to the earliest possible application filing date for – and prior to the date of invention of the purported inventions of the claims of – each of the Asserted Patents.
187. Verma is reflective of the knowledge and use by those other than the named inventors; public use; availability to the public; and/or sale of the purported inventions of the claims of the Asserted Patents, in this country and elsewhere, more than one year prior to the earliest possible application filing date of each of the Asserted Patents.
188. David P. Carlson was a named inventor on Provisional Application No. 61/197,904, filed on October 31, 2008, to which all the Asserted Patents except the '436 patent claim priority. However, David P. Carlson is not listed as an inventor on any of the Asserted Patents except the '436 patent.
189. David P. Carlson was involved in the development of EagleView's aerial roof measurement technology and system.
190. David P. Carlson made inventive contributions encompassed in at least one Asserted Claim of each Asserted Patent.

191. David P. Carlson was aware of a foreign company using aerial images to measure roofs prior to the earlier priority date of any Asserted Patent and prior to the earliest alleged conception of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
192. Neither David P. Carlson, Chris Pershing, nor anyone acting on their behalf disclosed to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Mr. Carlson's knowledge of a foreign company using aerial images to measure roofs prior to the earlier priority date of any Asserted Patent and prior to the earliest alleged conception of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
193. All of the Asserted Claims are invalid at least in view of the reasons set forth in the reports of Dr. Joseph Mundy that were presented during this case and in view of Dr. Mundy's deposition testimony from this case.
194. All of the Asserted Claims are invalid at least in view of the reasons set forth in the reports of Defendants' experts that were presented during this case and in view of the deposition testimony of those experts from this case.
195. A person of ordinary skill in the art with respect to the Asserted Patents is someone with a bachelor's degree in photogrammetry, computer vision, surveying, or civil engineering or an equivalent educational background, or having several years' worth of pertinent experience equivalent thereto, such as experience that is recognized by the American Society of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing.
196. Sungevity claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/047,086 (the "'086 provisional"), which was filed on April 22, 2008, and U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/025,431 (the "'431 provisional"), which was filed on February 1, 2008.
197. The '436 Patent is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Non-Provisional Application No. 12/148,439 (the "'439 non-provisional"), which was filed on April 17, 2008. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office concluded, during prosecution of Sungevity, that the '436 Patent is not entitled to claim the priority of its U.S. provisional application filed April 17, 2007.
198. During the prosecution of the application that issued as Sungevity, the pending claims were rejected by the patent examiner over the '436 Patent in an Office Action dated March 2, 2012.
199. In a September 4, 2012 amendment that was made "[i]n response to the official [office] action dated March 2, 2012," the applicant for the application that issued as Sungevity ("the Sungevity Applicant") cancelled the pending claims and presented new claims for examination. Two of those new claims were "copied in substantial portion from [the '436 Patent]."
200. In connection with its September 4, 2012 amendment, the Sungevity Applicant argued to the Patent Office that the '436 Patent's issued claims were not supported by the U.S. provisional application to which they claim priority.

201. In connection with its September 4, 2012 amendment, the Sungevity Applicant argued to the Patent Office that the '436 Patent's issued claims were not entitled to a priority date earlier than April 17, 2008.
202. Sungevity claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application 61/025,431 (the "'431 provisional"), which was filed on February 1, 2008. I
203. In connection with its September 4, 2012 amendment, the Sungevity Applicant argued to the Patent Office that its amended claims were entitled to claim priority to the '431 provisional, that the '431 provisional "fully supports" the amended claims, and that the amended claims therefore were entitled to a filing date of February 1, 2008.
204. On October 18, 2012, the Sungevity Applicant modified the format of its claims for examination in response to a September 18, 2012 notice from the patent examiner. The Sungevity Applicant did not modify the arguments for allowance that it presented to the patent examiner on September 4, 2012.
205. In a December 12, 2012 notice, the patent examiner acknowledged the "amendment/persuasive arguments filed on 10/18/12" by the applicant for the application that issued as Sungevity and deemed the pending claims to be allowable.
206. The issue date of and the filing dates for the applications that led to Sungevity – and to which the patent claims priority – are listed on the face of Sungevity.
207. For each Asserted Patent, its issue date and the filing dates for the applications that led to the patent are listed on the face of the patent.
208. In her declaration executed on August 24, 2016, Lynn Berard states that she is "a Principal Librarian at Carnegie Mellon University Libraries" and that she has been "a professional librarian for approximately 31 years" and "employed as a professional librarian at Carnegie Mellon University since August 14, 1985." XW00389607.
209. In her declaration executed on August 24, 2016, Lynn Berard states that the Engineering & Science Library at Carnegie Mellon University Libraries "is open to the general public throughout the year, with hours changing depending on the time of year." XW00389607. In that declaration, she explained:

During the Fall and Spring Semesters, the Engineering & Science Library is generally open from 8:00 a.m.-11:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m.-9:00 p.m. on Friday, 10:00 a.m.-9:00 p.m. on Saturday, and 12:00 p.m.-11:00 p.m. Sunday. During the summer, the Engineering & Science Library is generally open from 8:00 a.m.-11:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. on Friday, 12:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m. on Saturday, and 12:00 pm.-5:00 p.m. on Sunday. The Engineering & Science Library is closed on some weekends throughout the year.

XW00389607.

210. In her declaration executed on August 24, 2016, Lynn Berard explains:

I am familiar with the [Carnegie Mellon University] Libraries' cataloguing practices and procedures and the Sorrells Engineering & Science Library practices and procedures, including the Libraries' catalogue and policies and procedures regarding the receipt, indexing and availability of technical reports from the Carnegie Mellon University School of Computer Science ("Technical Reports"). These practices and procedures have remained consistent throughout my tenure at the Libraries, and I am aware that they have remained consistent since at least 1990. . . .

The universal practice for Technical Reports found at the Engineering & Science Library is to catalog the Technical Reports at Hunt Library, which is also a library within the Libraries system. According to the Libraries' policies and procedures, Technical Reports are indexed in the Libraries' catalogue and are made freely available to the faculty and student body of Carnegie Mellon University as well as to the general public. The Libraries' catalogue is searchable by subject, author, and keyword. These policies and procedures have been in effect and present in the catalogue searchable by subject, author, and keyword since the late 1980's. . . .

The Libraries' procedures for processing Technical Reports found at the Sorrells Engineering & Science Library are as follows: All print Technical Reports are catalogued at Hunt Library and entered into an electronic library catalog. A bound copy of the Technical Report is shelved in the appropriate library. The general timeline for cataloguing a Technical Report for access to the public is approximately six months after the Technical Report is received by the Hunt Library. During the cataloguing process, a physical barcode and a date stamp are affixed to the bound copy of the Technical Report. Once cataloguing is completed, the Technical Report is sent to the Sorrells Engineering & Science Library for shelving. The shelving process typically takes one week following completion of cataloguing. After shelving, the Technical Report is publicly available.

XW00389607-XW00389608.

211. In her declaration executed on August 24, 2016, Lynn Berard explains that based on its stamped cataloguing date of 05/30/1996, Hsieh, which is labeled with CMU-CS-95-195 "would have been accessible to the public at the Engineering & Science Library by **June 6, 1996.**" XW00389608-XW00389609.

Defendants intend to prove the following contested facts with regard to damages:

212. In November 2008, Xactware and EagleView entered into an agreement allowing EagleView to sell its roof reports through the Xactimate platform for a certain fee per report.
213. Verisk and EagleView Technology Corporation signed a detailed agreement (the “Verisk Agreement”) dated January 14, 2014 pursuant to which Verisk would acquire EagleView Technology Corporation for approximately \$650 million. In the Verisk Agreement, EagleView warranted and represented that Verisk and Xactware did not infringe any EagleView patents. The Verisk Agreement remained in effect from January 14, 2014 until December 16, 2014, when it was terminated because the Federal Trade Commission prohibited the proposed acquisition.
214. Vista Equity Partners (“Vista”) and EVTC signed a detailed agreement (the “Vista Agreement”) dated June 15, 2015 pursuant to which Vista would acquire EVTC for [REDACTED]. In the Vista Agreement, EVTC warranted and represented that Verisk and Xactware did not infringe any EagleView patents.
215. EagleView has not presented evidence supporting its entitlement to damages in the form of lost profits.
216. EagleView improperly concluded that the market for roof reports contains only two suppliers, EagleView and Xactware.
217. EagleView improperly disregarded companies offering competing products during the relevant period that constituted non-infringing alternatives to the Accused Products.
218. Prior to EagleView acquiring the company, GeoEstimator was a competitor of EagleView offering similar aerial-image-based roof measurement and report services and products.
219. Prior to EagleView acquiring the company, Pictometry was a competitor of EagleView offering similar aerial-image-based roof measurement and report services and products.
220. The contractor market for roof reports is distinct from the insurance market for roof reports.
221. There are significant differences between the insurance market for roof reports and the contractor market for roof reports.
222. EagleView failed to properly analyze the contractor market for roof reports and distinguish it from the insurance market for roof reports.
223. EagleView has not lost customers as a result of any alleged infringement by Defendants.
224. EagleView has not lost contractor customers as a result of any alleged infringement by Defendants.

- 225. There is no evidence of demand for the inventions recited in the Asserted Claims.
- 226. EagleView's marketing materials do not evidence demand for the inventions recited in the Asserted Claims.
- 227. Neither Render House nor Twister practice the inventions recited in the Asserted Claims.
- 228. Neither Render House nor Twister generate roof estimate reports.
- 229. EagleView roof report customers rely on Xactware's cost estimation products.
- 230. Verisk's attempt to purchase EagleView does not evidence any demand for EagleView's software or roof reports.
- 231. The Accused Products contain features not recited in any of the Asserted Claims.
- 232. The Accused Products contain features not offered by Eagle View's roof reports; there is no evidence that any consumer would have chosen EagleView's roof reports lacking these features but for the alleged infringement by Defendants.
- 233. Access to the Xactimate platform increases demand for EagleView's roof reports.
- 234. In November 2008, Xactware and EagleView entered into an agreement allowing EagleView to sell its roof reports through the Xactimate platform for a certain fee per report.
- 235. Xactware has developed a library of aerial imagery used to create roof reports that is at least as accurate as EagleView's collection of aerial imagery used to create its roof reports.
- 236. The relevant damages period, if any, began on the date the '840 patent issued, which is May 1, 2012.
- 237. Xactware's Accused Products contain features that are not covered by any of the claims of the Asserted Patents.
- 238. EagleView's roof reports contain features that are not covered by any of the claims of the Asserted Patents.
- 239. EagleView has provided roof reports integrated with the Xactimate platform since at least as early as 2009.
- 240. A portion of EagleView's insurance business relies on existing integration agreements with Xactware.
- 241. EagleView negotiates contracts for roof report products with various insurance providers, and also provides those providers with access to roof reports via the Xactimate platform.

- 242. Contractors benefit from access to updated material pricing data and labor rates from the Xactimate platform.
- 243. Consumers' decisions in purchasing roof reports are influenced by price.
- 244. Dr. Arnold did not conduct empirical studies or surveys of customers to support any of his opinions.
- 245. Dr. Arnold's damages opinion relies, at least in part, on patent claims that are no longer asserted in this case.
- 246. EagleView states on its website that multiple patents not asserted against Defendants in this action cover EagleView's roof reports.
- 247. From 2012 to the present, EagleView has not experienced erosion in the price of its roof reports that is attributable to Defendants.
- 248. There is no evidence that "but for" the alleged infringement, Eagle View would have been able to charge higher prices for its roof reports.
- 249. To the extent EagleView lowered its prices for roof reports, it was not due to any act or omission of Defendants.
- 250. The price of EagleView's roof reports declined for the three years before the alleged infringement began.
- 251. Defendants were not the "only significant source of downward pricing pressure" on EagleView's roof reports.
- 252. The Accused Products and EagleView's products are not perfect substitutes for one another.
- 253. EagleView's contractual relationships with its customers and the bargaining power of its customers impact the prices it charges for its roof reports.
- 254. Price elasticity impacts the prices EagleView can charge for its roof reports.
- 255. The market for roof reports is not inelastic.
- 256. Non-infringing alternatives impacted the prices EagleView can charge for its roof reports.
- 257. A royalty equal to the entirety of Xactware's incremental profit from sales of roof reports would not be reasonable.
- 258. Xactware would not have agreed to pay all of its profits from sales of roof reports to Eagle View as a royalty.

- 259. EagleView's assumed price of [REDACTED] for purposes of a reasonable royalty does not reflect Xactware's accused sales.
- 260. EagleView's assumed cost of [REDACTED] for purposes of a reasonable royalty does not reflect all relevant incremental costs.
- 261. Access to the Xactimate platform drives sales of EagleView's roof reports.
- 262. A hypothetical negotiation between EagleView and Defendants at the appropriate time would have resulted in a maximum royalty rate of less than [REDACTED] per report for all of the Asserted Patents.
- 263. There is no evidence that any alleged decrease in the price of EagleView's roof reports is the result of Defendants' alleged infringement.
- 264. There is no evidence that any alleged loss of Eagle View customers and market share is the result of Defendants' alleged infringement.
- 265. There is no evidence of irreparable harm to Eagle View from any alleged infringement by Defendants.
- 266. An injunction against Defendants would have a negative impact on the public interest.
- 267. Any purported harm to EagleView would be compensated by a reasonable royalty on further sales, so that EagleView is unable to show irreparable harm in the absence of an injunction.
- 268. Xactware would be irreparably harmed by an injunction which would destroy its roof estimation business; thus the balance of harms weighs against an injunction.
- 269. The Federal Trade Commission has stated, "Since receiving its first patent in 2011, EagleView has aggressively asserted its patent rights against most actual or potential competitors, suing two competitors and sending cease-and-desist letter to at least [redacted] others. Within the past three years, EagleView has eliminated almost all of these competitors, either by threatening and/or bringing intellectual property challenges or by acquisition.
- 270. The Federal Trade Commission has stated, "Though EagleView has yet to establish that any of its competitors infringe on its patents, any competitor or new entrant must be prepared to defend its products from EagleView's patent infringement claims, have access to a national library of high-resolution images and data, and be able to access insurance carriers through Claims Estimation Software.
- 271. The Federal Trade Commission has found that eliminating competition between EagleView and Xactware would harm the public, and prevented the acquisition of EagleView by Verisk because it would substantially lessen competition in violation of the Clayton Act and would constitute an unfair method of competition in violation of the FTC Act.

272. Granting the injunction sought by EagleView would result in the very outcome the Federal Trade Commission found harmful and in violation of multiple federal statutes, and thus would have a substantially negative impact on the public interest.
273. An injunction is against the public interest because it would delay and hinder insurers, contractors, and other customers from obtaining information from Defendants needed to rapidly respond to insureds' claims and would hinder the ability to rebuild insureds' properties after fire, natural disaster, or other loss.
274. Aerial Sketch is an acceptable, non-infringing alternative to the Asserted Claims of the '436 patent.
275. Neither Render House nor Twister practices or embodies any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
276. EagleView's roof reports do not practice or embody any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
277. Rooftop aerial measurement products are not coextensive with the alleged inventions claimed in Asserted Claims.
278. "Roof reports" are not coextensive with the alleged inventions claimed in the Asserted Claims.
279. Any success of EagleView's business is due to EagleView's business model or other factors unrelated to the Asserted Patents.
280. The value of Pictometry's aerial imagery library, acquisition techniques, image processing techniques, and other technology exceeds the value of EagleView's roof measurement software or techniques.
281. Most of the value of EagleView as a company lies in its current ownership of Pictometry and Pictometry's aerial imagery library, rather than in any of EagleView's roof measurement software or techniques.
282. Any success of products allegedly embodying any of the Asserted Claims is due to technical and market factors other than the claimed technology, including: the weather, macroeconomic conditions and construction industry growth, the Pictometry imagery library, access to the Xactimate Platform, access to compatible cost estimation databases, other licensed-in technologies, distribution networks and speed of delivery, business-process outsourcing activities, production volume capacity, report layout, and EagleView's policy of threatening and/or filing patent infringement suits against potential competitors.
283. Any commercial success of EagleView's reports is attributable to unpatented features.
284. Any commercial success of EagleView's reports is attributable to features of the EagleView reports covered by patents not asserted against Defendants.

285. Prior art methods exist for generating roof reports.
286. Prior art methods for generating roof reports produce similar results to products allegedly embodying the Asserted Claims.
287. Third parties have not licensed the Asserted Patents, except under threat of lawsuit.
288. EagleView enjoyed significant revenue from its rooftop aerial measurement products prior to the filing of several of the Asserted Patents.
289. Verisk's attempt to purchase EagleView does not evidence any commercial success of EagleView's Asserted Patents, software or roof reports.
290. Defendants did not publicly laud or praise any supposed invention of any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
291. Defendants' public statements and documents, to the extent they mention EagleView, do not refer specifically to any of the Asserted Patents.
292. There is no nexus between any evidence of commercial success of Twister and Render House and the any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.
293. Each Asserted Claim of each Asserted Patent is not coextensive in scope with Twister and Render House. As such, there is no presumption of nexus between any evidence of commercial success of Twister and Render House and an Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent.

Page 11

Page 12

Page 13

Page 14

Page 15

Page 16

Page 17

Page 18

Page 19

Page 20

Page 21

Page 22

Page 23

Page 24

Page 25

Page 26

Page 27

Page 28

Page 29

Page 30

Page 31

Page 32

Page 33

Page 34

Page 35

Page 36

Page 37

Page 38

Page 39

Page 40

Page 41

Page 42

Page 43

Page 44

Page 45

Page 46

Page 47

PART V. PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES AND SUMMARY OF THEIR TESTIMONY

Plaintiff intends to call the following witnesses with regard to liability and damages and anticipates they will testify as follows:

A. Will Call for Live Testimony

Witness	Summary of Testimony
Chris Pershing c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Pershing founded EagleView and served as its Chief Technology Officer until 2016. Mr. Pershing is an inventor of the Asserted Patents. He will testify regarding the success of the patented technologies and praise for the patented technologies, including by Defendants. He will also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, including the following: the conception and reduction to practice of certain of the claimed inventions; the prosecution of certain of the Asserted Patents; EagleView's ownership of the Asserted Patents; technical aspects regarding Plaintiff's products that practice inventions claimed in certain of the Asserted Patents and sales thereof; EagleView's knowledge and review of the Accused Products; infringement of the Accused Products; Defendants' willful infringement; non-infringing alternatives for the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents; products that embody or practice the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents; secondary considerations supporting that the patented claims are not obvious; validity of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents; the priority dates of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents; prior art Xactware has asserted against the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents; Defendants' willful infringement. He will also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Rishi Daga c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Daga joined EagleView in 2008 and is currently EagleView's Chief Executive Officer. He will testify regarding the success of the patented technologies and praise for the patented technologies, including by Defendants. He will also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, including the following: EagleView's corporate structure and ownership; communications among EagleView, Pictometry, and EagleView Technology Corporation; EagleView's ownership of the Asserted

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	<p>Patents; Verisk's intended acquisition of EagleView Technology Corporation; circumstances of creation of EagleView Technology Corporation; factual basis for EagleView's claim for damages in this case; products that embody or practice the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents; demand for EagleView's patented technology and products; non-infringing alternatives for the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents; EagleView's business; financial data relating to EagleView's products that practice the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents; EagleView's competitors and market share; valuation of EagleView's patents; licenses or other agreements concerning EagleView's patents; EagleView's knowledge and understanding of the suppliers of rooftop aerial measurement products in the market; secondary considerations supporting that the patented claims are not obvious; facts and circumstances relating to the price decline of EagleView's products over the years; EagleView's loss of certain customer accounts; Xactware's impact on EagleView's pricing and sales; EagleView's capacity to meet customer orders of EagleView's products; impact of price pressure from Xactware on EagleView roof report revenue; EagleView's products, marketing, customers, market share, and competitors; EagleView's prior and current practices for marking products with each of the Asserted Patents; EagleView's irreparable harm from Defendants' infringement; Defendants' willful infringement; EagleView's marking practices; damages resulting from Defendants' willful infringement; Verisk's intended acquisition of EagleView. He will also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Hugh West</p> <p>c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. West is the Vice President of Insurance Sales at EagleView. He will testify regarding, among other things, the following: the success of the patented technologies and praise for the patented technologies, including by Defendants; facts and circumstances relating to the price decline of EagleView's products over the years; demand for Eagle View's patented technology and products; EagleView's competitors and market share; valuation of EagleView's patents; EagleView's knowledge and understanding of the suppliers of rooftop aerial measurement products in the market; demand for Eagle View's patented technology and products; EagleView's</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	loss of certain customer accounts; Xactware's impact on EagleView's pricing and sales; EagleView's capacity to meet customer orders of EagleView's products; impact of price pressure from Xactware on EagleView roof report revenue; EagleView's products, marketing, customers, market share, and competitors; EagleView's irreparable harm from Defendants' infringement; Defendants' willful infringement; damages resulting from Defendants' willful infringement of the Asserted Patents. He will also testify regarding other subject matter which he may testify about at his deposition.

B. May Call for Live Testimony or by Deposition

Witness	Summary of Testimony
Chris Barrow c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Barrow is the former Chief Executive Officer of EagleView. He may testify regarding the success of the patented technologies and praise for the patented technologies, including by Defendants. He may also testify regarding, among other things, competition by EagleView competitors, Verisk's intended acquisition of EagleView, EagleView marketing practices, EagleView customers, EagleView finance, Defendants' willful infringement, and damages resulting from Defendants' willful infringement of the Asserted Patents. He will also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Matt Quilter c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Quilter is the Chief Financial Officer of EagleView. He may testify regarding the success of the patented technologies and praise for the patented technologies, including by Defendants. He may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, including the following: EagleView's corporate structure and ownership; EagleView's ownership of the Asserted Patents; sales data regarding EagleView's products that practice the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents; pricing of EagleView's products that practice the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents; profits and loss relating to the marketing and sale of EagleView's products that practice the claimed inventions of the Asserted Patents. He will also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	his deposition.
Jeffery Lewis (Xactware) c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Lewis is the Senior Vice President of Engineering at Geomni Inc. He may testify regarding praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants. He may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, including the following: the Accused Products; Defendants' designations for Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; design, development, functionality, architecture, implementation, operation, and features of the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; differences in design or operation of different versions of generations of the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; organization of source code related to the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; use of the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; research, design, use, development, manufacturing, marketing, servicing, sales or other product administration or support for the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; testing, quality control, and debugging of the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; similarities or differences between EagleView's aerial rooftop measurement products or software and those of Defendants; any efforts, attempts, or plans by Defendants to design, redesign, commercialize, or modify any Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; relative importance and valuation of the individual features of the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; Defendants' facts, theories, and arguments underlying any contention by Defendants that any Accused Product does not infringe the Asserted Patents; source code and documentation related to the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; communications regarding the scope of the claims of the Asserted Patents, infringement of the claims of the asserted Patents by Defendants or any other party, and/or the enforceability of the Asserted Patents; Defendants' positions on the validity, enforceability, or infringement by Defendants of any Asserted Patents; Defendants' contentions, affirmative defenses, or counterclaims related to infringement by Defendants of the Asserted Patents. He may also testify regarding other

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
<p>Jeffery Taylor (Xactware)</p> <p>c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Taylor is the President at Geomni Inc. and a former Vice President of Property InSight Group at Xactware. He may testify regarding praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants. He may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, including the following: the Accused Products, the Asserted Patents and how the Accused Products practice the same; marketing regarding the Accused Products; intended and/or target customers and end users of Accused Products; the impetus for designing, developing, and selling the Accused Products; third party involvement in design, development, programming, creation, marketing, sale, or resale of the Accused Products; Defendants' strategy and methodology to generate new products, potential new products, and product development ideas; communications with any users, purchasers, customers, or licensees regarding the Accused Products; activities of Geomni related to the Accused Products; Interaction between Geomni and Verisk; market research, market analyses, business plans, forecasts, marketing plans and/or user evaluations directed to the Accused Products; commercial success and profitability of the Accused Products; value of the Accused Products and any products that compete with the Accused Products; financial information related to the Accused Products; EagleView's products and technology; Defendants' interactions and exchange of information with EagleView; Defendants' knowledge of the Asserted Patents; communications with Defendants' customers; activities of Geomni; Defendants' policies and procedures for assessing and responding to patent infringement risks; and damages resulting from Defendants' infringement of the Asserted Patents, and relating to the reduction to practice of certain of the claimed inventions. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Mike Fulton (Xactware)</p> <p>c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Fulton is the President of Xactware. He may testify regarding praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants. He may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, including the following: Xactware's customers' use of the Accused Products; training, manuals,</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	and other documentations provided to Xactware's customers or users/purchasers of the Accused Products relating to the Accused Products; Xactware's effort to emulate or replicate any of EagleView's technologies or products; Xactware's organizational structure relating to the Accused Products; interactions among Insurance Services Office, Xactware, and Verisk; products that compete with the Accused products; marketing and promotion of the Accused Products; the relevant markets in which the Accused Products compete, Xactware's share in those markets, and the product characteristics or features necessary to be part of those markets; Xactware's products intended to be used in conjunction with the Accused Products. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Edmund Webecke (Xactware) c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Webecke is a Vice President at Xactware. He may testify regarding praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants. He may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, including the following: the Accused Products, the Asserted Patents and how the Accused Products practice the same, and sales information related to the Accused Products. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
James Loveland (Xactware) c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Loveland was formerly the President and Chief Executive Officer of Xactware, and was formerly the President of Verisk. He may testify regarding, among other things, praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants, dates and circumstances relating to when and how Defendants first learned of the Asserted Patents, EagleView, and EagleView's products; Defendants' efforts to market, advertise, or promote itself as similar to EagleView, or to promote the Accused Products and any components of the Accused Products; Defendants' assessment, consideration, or review of EagleView's products or patents; EagleView's source code, products, software, documents, or technical documentation in the possession or control of Defendants, and the circumstances by which Defendants acquired them; commercial relationship between EagleView and Defendants; Defendants' corporate structure, including all of Defendants' predecessors-in-interest, subsidiaries, parents,

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	<p>holding companies, related corporations and affiliates; Defendants' practice and procedure for assessing patent infringement risks, and how those practices and procedures have been applied regarding the Accused Products; any alleged non-infringing alternatives to the Accused Products; Defendants' belief regarding its willful infringement of the Asserted Patents; documents, opinions, or communications related to the validity of the Accused Patents or the Accused Products in view of the Asserted Patents; Defendants' license agreements related to the Accused Products or that are comparable to a license that Defendants would have taken in a hypothetical negotiation in this case; Defendants' policies and/or business plans concerning the licensing of the Accused Products or intellectual property covering the Accused Products; Defendants' contentions regarding the level of ordinary skill in the art for the Asserted Patents; Defendants' contentions that the Asserted Patents are unenforceable. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Peter Magnus Olson (Xactware)</p> <p>c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Olson is the Senior Vice President of Data & Production at Geomni, and was formerly the Assistant Vice President of Geospatial Data Services and the Director of Imagery Services at Xactware. He may testify, among other things, praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants, the Accused Products, Defendants' policies and procedures for assessing and responding to patent infringement risks, the Asserted Patents and how the Accused Products practice the same. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Jason Merrill (Xactware)</p> <p>c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Merrill is the Assistant Vice President of Finance at Xactware. He may testify regarding, among other things, praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants, Xactware's finances and financial statements (e.g., sales and cost data, invoice statement), as well as contracts Xactware has entered into. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Matthew Levin (Metropolitan Property and Casualty Insurance Company)</p>	<p>Mr. Levin is a claim technical administrator at MetLife. He may testify regarding, among other things, praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants,</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
<p>(“MetLife”)</p> <p>c/o Robinson & Cole LLP One Financial Plaza Suite 1430 Providence, RI 02903</p>	<p>EagleView’s products, the Accused Products, damages in this case, and MetLife’s decisions regarding whether to buy or use EagleView’s products and/or Xactware’s products. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Jason Pawlik (Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. (“The Hartford”))</p> <p>c/o The Hartford Law Department One Hartford Plaza H0-1-10 Hartford, CT 06155</p>	<p>Mr. Pawlik is a Director of Claims Strategy at The Hartford. He may testify regarding, among other things, praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants, EagleView’s products, the Accused Products, damages in this case, and The Hartford’s decisions regarding whether to buy or use EagleView’s products and/or Xactware’s products. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Michael Allen (United Services Automobile Association (“USAA”))</p> <p>c/o Ford Murray 10001 Reunion Place, Suite 640 San Antonio, TX 78216</p>	<p>Mr. Allen is a claims service manager at USAA. He may testify regarding, among other things, praise for the patented inventions, including by Defendants, EagleView’s products, the Accused Products, damages in this case, USAA’s decisions regarding whether to buy or use EagleView’s products and/or Xactware’s products. He will also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
4:22	4:24							
6:5	7:1							
7:24	8:5							
10:21	11:3	V, SP, ID	11:9	11:20	F, Spec, V			
14:13	15:17	ID, Cmpd, SP, PK, V, F	41:6 42:19	41:24 43:14	F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P	17:14 17:14	17:19 17:19	SP, PK SP, PK
17:1	17:3	ID, SP	41:6 42:19	41:24 44:5	F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P	17:14 17:14	17:19 17:19	SP, PK SP, PK
23:22	24:5							
24:9	24:25	ID, PK, SP, V	26:16 41:6 42:19	26:21 41:24 44:5	F, Spec, V F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P	17:14 17:14	17:19 17:19	SP, PK SP, PK
25:1	25:2	ID, F, NE	26:16 41:6 42:19	26:21 41:24 43:14	F, Spec, V F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P	17:14 17:14	17:19 17:19	SP, PK SP, PK
25:4	25:24	ID, M, V, PK, SP	26:16 41:6 42:19	26:21 41:24 44:5	F, Spec, V F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P	17:14 17:14	17:19 17:19	SP, PK SP, PK
27:19	27:25	PK, A, SP, H						
28:1	28:11	R, ID, PK, A, SP, H	28:24	29:3	F, V, Spec	20:9	20:12	
28:12	28:17	ID, PK, A, SP, H	27:19 28:24	27:22 29:3	F, V F, V, Spec	20:9	20:12	
31:10	31:12	NR, V, SP, PK, A, H						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
31:15	31:17	LD, V,						
32:7	32:12	MD, V, LD, A, H, PK, SP, BSS						
34:10	34:21	H						
40:20	40:23	ID, LD, F, V, SP, PK	40:7 40:13 40:18	40:11 40:16 40:19	F, V, Spec F, Spec F, Spec			
42:4	42:9	ID	41:6	42:3	F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char	17:14	17:19	SP, PK
42:10	42:13	ID	41:6 42:19	42:3 44:5	F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P	17:14 17:14	17:19 17:19	SP, PK SP, PK
44:11	44:14							
49:24	49:25	V, SP, PK, NE						
50:2	50:3	V, SP, PK						
53:10	53:12	ID, LD, V, NE	52:17 53:1	52:18 53:9	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec			
53:18	53:20	SP, PK, ID, LD, V, NE	52:17 53:1	52:18 53:9	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec			
53:22	53:22	ID	52:17 53:1	52:18 53:9	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec			
56:17	57:1	ID, SP, PK, V D, A, F	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
57:5	57:5	ID, SP, PK, V D, A, SP, F	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
57:11	57:19	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, SP	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
57:20	57:23	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
58:4	58:9	ID, D, A, SP, PK, V, LD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
58:14	58:16	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
58:20	59:9	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
59:12	59:17	ID, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, PK	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
59:19	59:20	ID, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, PK	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
59:21	59:23	ID, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, PK, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
60:1	60:1	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
60:2	60:4	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
60:8	60:9	ID, PK, A, SP, V, LD,	57:6	57:10	F, V, Spec			R, V, IC

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		D, MD	57:24	58:2	F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	
60:12	61:7	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
61:11	61:14	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
61:20	61:20	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
61:23	61:25	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
62:3	62:6	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, Compd	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
62:9	62:9	ID, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, Compd	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
62:10	62:20	ID, PK, A, SP, V, LD, D, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC
63:7	63:10	PK, V, LD, M	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	12:17	12:18	R, V, IC

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
8:22	8:24							
9:6	9:11							
14:3	14:7							
22:12	23:7	LC, SP, BST, V						
23:8	23:16							
23:17	23:25							
24:1	24:5							
24:10	24:16		24:17	24:22				
24:23	25:17	M, NE, F, V						
37:14	37:17	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M						
37:20	37:22	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M						
37:23	38:1	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M						
38:3	38:3	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M	38:4	38:11	P, R	38:12	38:15	IC
39:22	39:23	ID, LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering	39:16 39:21	39:17 39:21	C, P, R, U			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
40:1	40:1	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering	39:16 39:21	39:17 39:21	C, P, R, U			
46:12	46:14	ID, LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering	46:15	46:15				
46:20	46:20	ID, LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering						
50:6	50:8	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering						
50:12	50:13	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering						
53:10	53:12	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering						
53:15	53:17	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, M, C, Badgering						
54:22	54:24	V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, C						
55:2	55:5	V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, C						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
57:7	57:12	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, R, Arg, BST, C, Badgering	56:24 57:2	56:25 57:6	C, P, R, U			
64:1	64:6	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, Arg, BST, C, Badgering						
64:11	64:11	LC, IO, F, NE, V, P, PK, SP, Arg, BST, C, Badgering						
65:15	65:20	R, C, P						
66:10	66:11	R, C, P, SP, PK						
66:14	66:19	R, C, P, SP, PK						
66:20	67:4	R, C, P, SP, PK						
72:17	72:20	R, C, P, SP, PK						
74:10	74:13	R, C, P, SP, PK						
80:2	80:3	NT						
80:18	81:2	A, NE, F	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
83:5	84:12	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
84:14	84:15	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
92:4	92:23	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK						
99:5	99:9	NE, F, V, R, BST	99:10	99:21				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
99:22	100:12	NE, F, V, M, R, BST	100:13 100:20	100:17 102:1	C, P, R; IC (100:20-23); AT (101:13-16)	100:18	100:19	IC
104:4	104:14	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
104:15	105:9	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
105:18	105:23	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK	80:7 105:24	80:13 106:14	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
106:15	106:24	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
120:18	120:25	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK, M, BST	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
121:15	122:3	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK, C	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
125:13	125:23	A, NE, F, 1002, SP, PK, R	80:7	80:13	NT (80:9)	80:14	80:17	
125:24	126:2	R	126:8 127:10	126:16 127:20		126:27; 127:21; 128:4	127:9; 128:1; 128:6	IC; F; V (for all)
128:23	128:24	R, 1002, SP, PK						
128:23	128:25	R, 1002, SP, PK						
129:2	129:5	R, 1002, SP, PK	129:6 129:11	129:8 129:12		129:13	129:15	M; F; NE; PK; SP
129:19	130:2	F, NE, M, MD, H, SP,	129:6	129:8		129:13	129:15	M; F; NE; PK; SP

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		PK	129:11 130:3 130:7	129:12 130:4 130:20				
130:21	130:24	M, P, R, NE, F, Arg	129:6 129:11 130:3 130:7	129:8 129:12 130:4 130:20		129:13	129:15	M; F; NE; PK; SP
131:1	131:1	M, P, R, NE, F	129:6 129:11 130:3 130:7	129:8 129:12 130:4 130:20		129:13	129:15	M; F; NE; PK; SP
131:17	131:20	M, P, R, NE, F, Arg	129:6 129:11 130:3 130:7	129:8 129:12 130:4 130:20		129:13	129:15	M; F; NE; PK; SP
131:22	132:5	M, P, R, NE, F, Arg	129:6 129:11 130:3 130:7	129:8 129:12 130:4 130:20		129:13	129:15	M; F; NE; PK; SP
132:7	132:7	M, P, R, NE, F	129:6 129:11 130:3 130:7	129:8 129:12 130:4 130:20		129:13	129:15	M; F; NE; PK; SP
132:25	133:4							
133:6	133:6							

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
133:9	133:19							
134:4	134:18	1002, H, F						
135:8	135:13	1002, H, F						
135:16	135:16	1002, H, F						
136:5	136:20	R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK						
136:22	136:22	R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK						
137:1	137:17	ID	137:18	138:1	IC			
137:18	138:1	ID	137:12	137:17	IC			
138:2	138:7	M, F	138:23 139:5	139:3 139:11				
138:9	138:22	M, F	138:23 139:5	139:3 139:11				
146:5	146:5	A, R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, V	145:22	145:25	IC, NT			
146:20	146:21	A, R, 1002, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, V	145:22	145:25	IC, NT			
148:12	148:16	A, R, 1002, LC, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, V						
148:17	148:20	A, R, 1002, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, IO, P, V, NR						
149:18	149:22	A, R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, V						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
152:12	152:21	A, R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, AT, V						
152:23	152:24	A, R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, V						
152:25	153:2	A, R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, V						
154:4	154:11	A, R, 1002, H, F, NE, SP, PK, ID, P, AT, V, BST						
154:13	154:16	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
154:17	154:20	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
154:21	154:24	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
155:1	155:9	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT						
155:11	155:23	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
155:24	156:5	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
156:7	156:11	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
157:17	158:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK,						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		P, V						
158:16	158:20	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
159:8	159:21	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT						
159:22	160:12	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT						
160:13	160:22	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
160:24	160:25	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
161:5	162:8	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT, MD						
162:9	162:12	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
162:14	162:22	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
162:23	163:12	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
163:22	164:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
165:20	165:21	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
165:25	166:2	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK,						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		P, V						
166:8	166:12	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
166:13	166:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
168:15	169:4	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT, Arg						
169:5	169:13	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
171:3	171:13	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
173:2	173:3	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
173:7	173:10	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
173:12	173:24	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
186:10	187:2	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT, BST						
187:4	187:21	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
187:22	187:24	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
188:1	188:6	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK,						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		P, V, AT						
189:7	189:10	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT						
189:11	189:14	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
189:16	189:21	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT						
190:24	191:5	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, Arg						
191:20	191:21	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, Arg						
191:23	192:7	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, Arg, AT						
192:9	192:9	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
196:7	196:8	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
196:11	196:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
196:17	196:17	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
201:3	201:13	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
201:15	202:3	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK,						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		P, V, AT, BST						
202:5	202:23	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
205:21	205:23	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
206:3	206:5	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT, Arg, BST, Badgering						
207:3	207:5	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
207:8	207:10	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NT						
207:12	207:12	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NT						
208:9	208:10	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
208:13	208:13	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
209:5	209:16	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
210:4	210:14	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NT						
210:19	211:4	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
211:5	211:8	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
211:17	211:22	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
212:18	212:22	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, 1002						
213:6	213:16	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT, 1002						
213:17	213:21	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, 1002						
213:25	214:16	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT, BST						
214:18	214:18	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
214:19	215:5	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NT, A						
215:25	216:1	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, 1002, A, BST						
216:4	216:10	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, 1002, A, BST						
216:14	216:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, 1002, A, BST						
216:17	216:19	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, Arg, A, 1002						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
216:20	218:11	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, 1002, A						
218:25	219:7	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
219:11	220:7	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, AT, LC, Arg						
220:15	220:18	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
220:20	220:20	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
221:2	222:9	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, Arg, LC, IO, AT						
222:11	222:16	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, Arg						
224:2	224:4	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
224:7	224:12	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
224:15	224:17	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
224:20	225:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, Cmpd						
225:17	225:18	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK,						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		P, V, A, 1002, NT						
225:21	226:7	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002	225:19	225:21	IC, NT			
226:24	227:4	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, BST						
229:8	229:14	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, AT						
229:15	229:17	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
233:22	234:11	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V						
235:19	235:19	NT, AT, R						
235:21	235:22	NT, R						
239:11	239:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, BST						
239:24	239:25	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, BST						
240:3	240:11	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
240:24	241:15	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
241:17	241:18	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, AT						
241:22	241:24	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK,						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		P, V, A, 1002, AT						
242:1	242:18	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, AT, NT, BST						
242:20	242:25	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NT						
243:2	243:6	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NR, BST						
243:8	243:8	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NR, BST						
248:23	248:23	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002						
249:4	249:14	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, BST						
249:16	249:19	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, NT, BST						
250:17	251:4	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, H						
251:5	251:17	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, H						
255:4	255:9	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NT, A, 1002						
258:11	259:4	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK,						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Mike Fulton (October 4, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		P, V, A, 1002, Arg, LC						
259:6	259:10	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, A, 1002, LC						
259:23	260:2	NT, R						
264:14	265:3	ID, R, F, NE, SP, PK, P, V, NT, Arg						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
7:18	7:20							
10:18	11:20							
14:10	14:11							
14:16	14:22		79:13 79:22 80:1 81:23 82:5	79:18 79:25 81:12 81:25 82:17	F, IC	77:23 82:19	78:20 82:25	V, SP, PK
15:1	15:2	NT						
15:4	15:18	ID; F; LD						
15:20	15:20	ID; F; LD						
15:22	15:24	ID; F; LD						
16:5	16:5	ID; F; LD						
24:11	24:23	F; V; PK						
25:15	25:17	ID; V; F	26:2 26:8 79:13 79:22 80:1 81:23 82:5	26:4 26:14 79:18 79:25 81:12 81:25 82:17	IC, R	77:23 82:19	78:20 82:25	V, SP, PK
25:24	25:24	ID; V; F	26:2 26:8 79:13	26:4 26:14 79:18	IC, R	77:23	78:20	V, SP, PK

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			79:22 80:1 81:23 82:5	79:25 81:12 81:25 82:17				
27:15	28:15	ID; F; V, SP, PK	126:3	126:10	IC, R	126:11	126:18	IC, R
30:21	31:4	ID; PK; F; SP	31:5 79:13 79:22 80:1 81:23	31:7 79:18 79:25 81:12 81:25	IC, R	31:8 77:23	31:11 78:20	IC, R V, SP, PK
31:23	31:25	ID; F; NR						
32:6	32:7	ID; PK; F; SP						
32:19	33:6	ID; V	33:7 33:15 33:18 33:22 34:6	33:8 33:16 33:18 34:21 34:11	Spec, PK, F			
34:12	34:14	ID						
34:17	34:24	ID						
35:2	35:5	ID; PK; V; F						
39:17	39:20	ID	39:21	40:25		41:3	41:5	IC, R
42:21	43:5	NR; V; PK; Cmpd; SP; NE; F; R; P						
44:12	44:18	ID; V; PK; Cmpd; SP;						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		NE; F; R; P						
44:25	44:25	ID; V; PK; Cmpd; SP; NE; F; R; P						
45:2	45:10	V; R; F						
47:2	47:10	1002						
47:19	48:23	1002; H; PK	48:24	49:1				
56:2	56:5	ID; V; Arg; LC; F; SP; NE; P	54:12 54:19	54:16 54:21		54:23 55:8 31:23 32:6	55:1 55:15 31:25 32:7	V, SP, PK, IC V, SP, PK, IC IC, SP, PK IC, SP, PK
56:9	56:9	ID; V; Arg; LC; F; SP; NE; P	54:12 54:19	54:16 54:21	IC, IN, R, P	54:23 55:8 31:23 32:6	55:1 55:15 31:25 32:7	V, SP, PK, IC V, SP, PK, IC IC, SP, PK IC, SP, PK
67:10	67:12	1002						
67:14	68:6	1002; ID						
68:18	69:14	M; F; NE; PK; SP	69:15	69:20				
69:21	70:5	V						
70:19	70:24	ID; SP; V	71:14 71:17	71:15 71:18				
71:2	71:2	ID; SP; V	71:14 71:17	71:15 71:18				
71:4	71:6	ID; F; V; SP; PK	71:14 71:17	71:15 71:18				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
71:12	71:12	ID; F; V; SP; PK	71:14	71:15				
			71:17	71:18				
71:20	71:22	ID; SP; V	71:14	71:15				
			71:17	71:18				
72:2	72:2	ID; SP; V	71:14	71:15				
			71:17	71:18				
85:9	85:11	ID; F; V; NE; SP; PK	86:20	86:21	R, C			
			86:24	86:24				
			87:2	87:5				
85:14	85:17	ID; F; V; NE; SP; PK	86:20	86:21	R, C			
			86:24	86:24				
			87:2	87:5				
85:19	85:21		86:20	86:21	R, C			
			86:24	86:24				
			87:2	87:5				
87:8	87:17	F; V; ID; SP						
88:1	88:18	F; V; R; SP						
89:25	89:25							
90:2	90:2							
90:3	90:15	1002; H						
90:24	91:2	ID						
91:4	91:7	F; A						
91:8	91:13	F; A; 1002; H						
96:22	97:14	ID; F; V; SP						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
97:16	97:16	ID; F; V; SP						
97:18	98:21	ID; PK; SP; LD	54:12 54:19 98:22	54:16 54:21 99:2	IC, IN, NR, R, P	54:23 55:8 99:4	55:1 55:15 99:8	V, SP, PK, IC V, SP, PK, IC IC, P
99:4	99:8	ID; V; SP						
101:11	101:22	1002; H						
102:6	103:12	ID; PK; F; M; LD; SP						
103:15	103:15	ID; PK; F; M; LD; SP						
104:5	105:5	1002; H; SP; PK; LD; NT						
105:10	105:12	F; ID; PK; SP	105:13	105:14				
105:22	105:24	ID; Cmpd; V; SP	106:3	106:20				
106:1	106:1	ID; Cmpd; V; SP	106:3	106:20				
109:9	109:18	ID; PK; SP; V; R						
130:13	131:3	NT						
131:8	131:10	NT						
131:15	131:17	NT						
131:22	131:23	NT						
132:4	132:5	NT						
132:10	132:11	NT						
132:16	132:17	NT						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
7:13	8:6	IDe						
11:2	12:5	IDe	12:6	12:15	R, C			
12:16	13:10	IDe						
13:17	14:7	IDe						
14:20	14:23	IDe						
15:2	15:7	IDe						
15:25	16:5	IDe						
16:8	16:17	IDe	16:18	16:23	R, C			
16:24	17:20	IDe						
17:21	17:25	IDe						
18:18	19:6	IDe						
22:20	22:22	V, IDe	23:5	23:13				
23:1	23:4	IDe						
25:20	26:6	IDe						
26:14	26:18	V, IDe						
26:22	26:22	V, IDe						
27:6	27:9	IDe						
27:10	27:18	IDe						
28:1	28:5	IDe						
28:13	28:16	IDe						
28:17	28:19	IDe						
28:20	29:4	IDe						
29:6	30:3	IDe						
30:4	30:20	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
30:21	31:12	IDe						
31:13	31:21	IDe						
31:24	32:4	IDe						
32:11	32:13	V, M, IDe						
32:19	33:1	V, M, IDe						
33:2	34:4	IDe						
34:5	34:11	IDe						
34:12	34:13	F, SP, IDe						
34:17	34:21	IDe						
36:8	36:12	F, SP, IDe						
36:15	36:23	F, SP, IDe						
37:25	38:4	IDe						
38:5	38:20	IDe	38:21	39:6	C			
39:8	39:16	IDe	38:21	39:6	C			
39:17	39:20	IDe						
40:13	40:16	M, Cmpd, V, IDe						
40:19	41:4	M, Cmpd, V, IDe						
41:18	41:19	V, SP, IDe						
41:22	41:25	V, SP, IDe						
42:3	42:22	IDe						
42:23	43:7	IDe						
43:8	43:11	V, SP, IDe						
43:16	43:22	V, SP, IDe						
43:24	44:2	V, SP, M, IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
44:9	44:14	V, SP, M, IDe						
47:19	48:1	IDe						
49:8	49:12	IDe						
49:13	49:18	IDe						
55:11	55:16	V, F, IDe						
55:17	55:20	V, F, M, IDe						
55:24	56:1	IDe						
56:17	56:19	M, IDe						
56:23	57:1	M, IDe						
57:23	57:24	V, IDe						
58:3	58:10	IDe						
60:15	60:17	V, SP, F, L, IDe						
60:21	60:24	V, SP, F, L, IDe						
61:16	61:24	IDe						
62:15	62:20	IDe						
62:23	63:2	IDe						
64:11	64:17	IDe						
68:13	68:17	IDe						
68:18	68:24	IDe						
69:16	69:21	M, IDe						
69:25	70:5	M, IDe						
70:7	70:12	IDe						
70:22	71:2	M, IDe						
71:6	71:13	M, IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
72:8	72:19	IDe						
72:21	72:23	Cmpd, IDe						
73:1	73:4	Cmpd, IDe						
75:23	75:25	F, SP, IDe						
76:3	76:13	F, SP, IDe						
78:7	78:10	SP, IDe						
78:14	78:14	SP, IDe						
79:2	79:7	IDe						
84:4	84:6	SP, PK, F, IDe						
84:9	84:11	SP, PK, F, IDe						
84:12	84:17	IDe						
84:22	84:23	SP, PK, F, V, IDe						
85:3	85:6	IDe						
85:19	86:5	V, IDe						
86:6	86:15	V, IDe						
86:19	86:24	V, IO, 701, IDe						
88:12	88:16	Cmpd, V, IDe						
88:19	88:22	Cmpd, V, IDe						
88:23	89:1	IDe						
89:2	89:7	M, IDe						
89:11	89:14	M, IDe						
90:23	91:2	IDe						
92:2	92:9	ID, SP, PK, R, IDe						
92:15	92:18	Cmpd, SP, PK, R, IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
92:22	92:24	Cmpd, SP, PK, R, IDe						
93:11	93:14	V, SP, PK, R, IDe						
93:19	93:19	V, SP, PK, R, IDe						
94:7	94:16	V, SP, PK, R, IDe						
94:21	94:22	V, SP, PK, R, IDe						
94:25	95:7	V, R, IDe						
95:20	95:24	V, SP, PK, R, IDe						
96:2	96:2	IDe						
96:3	96:3	F, SP, IDe						
96:8	96:12	F, SP, IDe						
96:13	96:17	IDe						
96:18	96:20	V, F, SP, IDe						
97:1	97:2	IDe						
97:14	97:17	Cmpd, V, IDe						
97:20	98:12	Cmpd, V, IDe						
98:17	98:21	IDe						
98:22	99:9	IDe						
99:10	99:15	IDe						
99:18	99:20	IDe						
99:25	100:15	IDe						
100:17	100:20	IDe						
100:21	100:22	IDe						
100:23	101:2	IDe						
101:3	101:5	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
101:6	101:8	F, SP, IDe						
101:12	101:13	F, SP, IDe						
101:14	101:18	IDe						
102:9	102:12	IDe						
103:4	103:7	Cmpd, V, IDe						
103:8	103:11	Cmpd, V, IDe						
104:7	104:13	Cmpd, ID, IDe						
104:18	104:23	IDe						
105:12	105:23	Cmpd, V, SP, IDe						
106:3	106:15	F, V, L, IDe						
106:19	106:21	F, V, L, IDe						
109:5	109:12	IDe						
109:13	109:18	IDe						
109:21	110:11	IDe						
110:12	110:14	IDe						
110:15	110:19	IDe						
110:20	110:21	V, SP, PK, IDe						
111:1	111:8	IDe						
111:12	111:18	IDe						
112:25	113:7	IDe						
113:8	113:14	ID, IDe	113:15 120:14	113:17 120:21		120:25	121:5	IDe
113:18	113:22	ID, IDe	113:15 120:14	113:17 120:21		120:25	121:5	IDe

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
113:23	114:11	IDe	113:15 120:14	113:17 120:21		120:25	121:5	IDe
114:12	114:19	IDe	113:15 120:14	113:17 120:21		120:25	121:5	IDe
115:13	116:1	IDe						
116:22	117:2	F, SP, ID, V, IDe	117:5	117:9	R, C			
122:19	122:24	IDe						
123:8	123:14	IDe						
123:17	123:20	IDe						
123:21	123:24	IDe						
124:2	124:20	IDe						
124:23	125:3	IDe						
125:4	125:11	IDe						
125:12	125:14	SP, F, V, IO, 701, IDe	127:2 127:16	127:11 127:18	IC	126:14 126:22	126:18 127:1	IDe, SP IDe, SP
125:20	125:22	SP, F, V, IO, 701, IDe						
128:11	128:21	IDe						
128:22	129:24	SP, PK, V, IDe						
130:15	130:18	SP, PK, V, IDe						
130:21	130:24	SP, PK, V, IDe						
131:1	131:4	IDe						
131:18	132:4	IDe						
132:13	132:19	V, F, SP, NE, IDe						
132:23	133:1	V, F, SP, NE, IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
133:7	133:10	IDe						
133:11	134:9	IDe						
134:10	134:13	Cmpd, V, IDe						
134:16	134:24	V, IDe						
135:3	135:5	IDe						
135:8	135:15	IDe						
136:13	136:23	V, F, IDe						
137:2	137:5	V, F, Cmpd, IDe						
137:7	137:7	V, F, Cmpd, IDe						
137:10	137:12	IDe						
138:1	138:18	IDe						
138:19	139:5	F, NE, Cmpd, V, IDe						
139:8	139:18	IDe	139:19	139:20		139:21	139:22	IDe, SP
140:12	140:14	M, NE, F, IDe						
140:18	140:20	M, NE, F, IDe						
140:23	141:14	M, Cmpd, IDe						
141:17	141:19	M, Cmpd, IDe						
141:21	142:9	IDe						
142:18	142:20	V, SP, F, IDe						
142:24	143:1	V, SP, F, IDe						
143:2	143:12	F, PK, SP, IDe						
143:13	144:3	F, PK, SP, IDe						
144:7	144:8	IDe						
144:9	144:22	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
146:5	146:7	F, NE, V, IDe						
146:12	146:21	F, NE, V, IDe						
146:22	147:1	F, NE, V, IDe						
148:4	148:12	M, V, IDe						
148:16	148:18	M, V, IDe						
150:20	150:24	V, NE, F, SP, IDe						
151:2	151:7	V, NE, F, SP, IDe						
152:6	152:10	IDe						
152:18	152:21	IDe	153:3 153:11	153:7 153:18	R, C			
154:6	154:15	F, NE, V, IDe						
157:19	158:3	IDe						
161:8	161:18	IDe						
161:19	161:20	F, NE, L, IDe						
161:24	162:1	F, NE, L, IDe						
167:11	167:15	F, V, IDe						
167:19	168:2	F, V, IDe						
173:21	174:8	V, IDe						
174:12	174:12	IDe						
174:13	174:16	IDe						
174:17	174:24	IDe						
174:25	175:3	IDe						
175:16	176:6	F, ID, M, V, IDe	175:5 175:11	175:7 175:12				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
178:17	178:22	V, F, NE, IDe						
178:23	178:24	IDe						
178:25	179:2	IDe						
180:18	180:24	V, F, NE, Cmpd, IDe						
180:25	181:5	IDe						
182:25	183:4	V, F, IDe						
183:5	183:13	IDe						
183:24	184:2	V, IDe						
184:5	184:5	V, IDe						
184:8	184:24	IDe						
187:5	187:11	V, F, IDe						
187:12	187:22	V, F, IDe						
191:13	191:18	IDe						
191:19	191:21	IDe						
191:25	192:13	IDe						
193:11	193:13	SP, F, NE, IDe						
193:17	193:19	SP, F, NE, IDe						
193:20	193:22	SP, F, NE, IDe						
194:19	194:22	IDe						
195:4	195:14	IDe						
202:14	202:18	SP, F, IDe	203:1	203:14		203:22	203:25	IDe, Cmpd, SP, V
206:1	206:11	IDe						
208:2	208:9	IDe	208:11	208:18				
209:18	209:24	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
209:25	210:10	IDe						
210:23	211:5	IDe						
211:6	211:10	IDe						
211:11	211:14	SP, LC, V, IO, 701, IDe						
211:19	212:2	SP, LC, V, IO, 701, IDe						
213:12	213:18	IDe						
213:19	213:20	SP, F, IO, IDe						
213:24	214:2	SP, F, IO, IDe						
214:3	214:10	SP, F, IO, Cmpd, V, IDe						
215:3	215:6	SP, F, IO, Cmpd, V, IDe						
215:9	215:11	SP, F, IO, Cmpd, V, IDe						
221:18	221:21	SP, F, IO, V, IDe						
221:23	222:3	SP, F, IO, V, IDe						
226:10	226:12	SP, F, IO, Cmpd, V, IDe						
226:16	226:23	SP, F, IO, Cmpd, V, IDe						
226:24	227:3	SP, F, IO, Cmpd, V, IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
230:19	231:2	SP, F, IO, NE, V, IDe						
234:2	234:7	SP, F, IO, V, IDe						
234:10	234:14	SP, F, IO, V, IDe						
240:2	240:10	V, Cmpd, IDe						
240:12	240:16	V, Cmpd, IDe						
240:17	240:19	V, SP, IDe						
240:23	241:4	IDe						
242:11	242:13	V, Cmpd, IDe						
242:16	242:18	V, Cmpd, IDe						
242:19	242:25	IDe						
243:22	243:23	V, IDe						
244:2	244:11	V, Cmpd, IDe						
249:14	249:19	V, Cmpd, IDe						
249:20	249:25	V, Cmpd, IDe						
250:1	250:8	IDe						
250:9	250:16	F, IDe						
251:7	251:12	IDe						
251:15	252:1	V, Cmpd, IDe						
260:11	261:3	IDe						
261:4	261:12	IDe						
261:22	261:24	V, SP, IDe						
262:2	262:7	IDe						
262:8	262:19	IDe						
263:7	263:17	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
263:18	263:21	IDe						
264:3	264:7	IDe						
264:25	265:4	IDe						
265:12	265:16	IDe						
265:17	265:22	IDe						
266:6	266:9	IDe						
266:10	266:15	IDe						
268:4	268:6	IDe						
276:14	276:18	F, V, IDe						
276:21	277:1	F, V, IDe						
277:2	277:8	IDe						
277:11	277:14	M, IDe						
277:18	277:23	M, IDe						
288:7	288:10	V, F, SP, IDe						
288:13	288:15	V, F, SP, IDe						
292:21	292:22	ID, F, NE, V, IDe	292:15	292:20	R, C, ML			
293:1	293:12	IDe						
294:2	294:4	IDe						
294:16	294:24	IDe						
295:16	295:20	IDe	295:21 296:2	296:1 296:5				
296:6	296:16	IDe	303:13	304:1		302:20 303:3	302:24 303:7	IDe, M, SP IDe, M, SP
298:9	298:19	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
300:13	300:21	IDe						
304:17	304:20	F, NE, V, IDe						
304:24	305:4	F, NE, V, IDe						
305:19	306:6	IDe						
306:10	306:12	V, IDe						
306:16	306:23	V, IDe						
307:5	307:20	IDe	313:17 314:3	313:24 314:3	PK, Spec			
309:2	309:7	IDe						
309:8	309:14	IDe						
309:20	310:1	IDe	313:17 314:3	313:24 314:3	PK, Spec			
310:20	310:23	SP, F, IDe	313:17 314:3	313:24 314:3	PK, Spec			
311:1	311:3	IDe	313:17	313:24	PK, Spec			
311:11	311:12	V, IDe	313:17 314:3	313:24 314:3	PK, Spec			
311:16	311:19	V, IDe	313:17 314:3	313:24 314:3	PK, Spec			
312:16	312:17	F, SP, IDe	313:17 314:3	313:24 314:3	PK, Spec			
312:21	312:25	F, SP, IDe	313:17 314:3	313:24 314:3	PK, Spec			
314:7	314:10	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 24, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
314:20	314:25	IDe						
316:4	316:8	F, Cmpd, SP, IDe						
316:11	316:15	F, Cmpd, SP, IDe						
318:16	318:20	V, SP, Cmpd, P, IDe						
318:22	318:23	V, SP, Cmpd, P, IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
333:6	334:6	IDE; R, P						
334:18	334:22	IDE; F, IO, 701, LC						
334:23	335:4	IDE; F, IO, 701, LC						
344:23	345:4	IDE; 1002						
346:9	346:13	IDE; 1002: NT						
346:25	347:9	IDE; 1002; PR						
347:16	348:5	IDE; 1002; PR, R						
358:1	358:2	IDE; V, R, IO, 701, LC, SP, BST						
358:6	358:11	IDE; V, R, IO, 701, LC, SP, BST						
359:5	359:14	IDE; V, R, IO, 701, LC, SP, BST						
360:20	361:5	IDE; NT						
362:1	362:21	IDE; 1002						
367:17	368:10	IDE; H, F, 1002, SP, PK, V	368:11	368:13	R, C			
372:23	373:9	IDE; NT						
373:12	373:24	IDE; 1002, R						
374:2	374:5	IDE; 1002, SP	376:24 377:5	377:1 377:10		376:24	377:1	IDE, C
						377:5	377:10	IDE, C
374:10	375:20	IDE; 1002, ID, NT, V						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
375:21	376:3	IDe; R, F, SP						
376:9	376:13	IDe; SP, PK						
376:14	376:19	IDe; R, 1002, NE, F						
382:2	383:9	IDe; 1002, NE, MD, M, F, Arg, SP, PK	383:10	383:13	R, C, PK			
383:14	383:21	IDe; 1002, SP, PK, R, V, F, Arg, NE						
383:22	384:10	IDe; 1002	384:11	384:17	R, C, PK			
384:23	385:2	IDe; 1002, F, NE, SP, PK, R, V, Arg	384:11	384:17	R, C, PK			
385:10	385:13	IDe; V, H, 1002, NE, F, SP, PK, Arg, MD	384:11	384:17	R, C, PK			
385:17	385:22	IDe; V, H, 1002, NE, F, SP, PK, Arg, MD	384:11	384:17	R, C, PK			
387:23	388:3	IDe; 1002, H						
388:15	388:21	IDe; R, SP	388:4	388:14	R, C			
391:20	392:4	IDe; Cpmd, V, F, NE, SP, PK						
392:13	392:16	IDe; V, NE, F, SP, PK, Arg, MD, M, P, C, BST	383:10 384:11	383:13 384:17	R, C, PK			
392:21	392:24	IDe; V, NE, F, SP, PK, Arg, MD, M, P, C, BST	383:10 384:11	383:13 384:17	R, C, PK			
394:14	394:17	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
394:19	394:19	IDe						
395:1	395:5	IDe; 1002, A, SP, PK, F, V						
404:25	405:2	IDe						
405:4	405:12	IDe; 1002, SP, PK, A						
405:13	405:23	IDe; 1002, SP, PK, A, NE						
405:24	406:8	IDe; 1002, SP, PK, A, R, F, NE, Arg						
419:13	419:20	IDe; F						
419:24	420:11	IDe; F; M; NE; SP; PK; V						
420:15	420:21	IDe; F; M; NE; SP; PK; V						
421:7	421:20	IDe; V, SP, 701, IO, Arg, PK, NE						
421:24	422:20	IDe; V; SP, 701; IO, NE, M, Arg, PK						
423:20	424:2	IDe; ID, SP, PK, V, F, NE, M, Arg	423:18	423:19	R, C	423:10	423:17	IDe, SP, PK, V, F, NE, M, ID,
424:6	424:14	IDe; SP, PK, V, F, NE, M, Arg						
432:2	432:5	IDe						
432:21	432:23	IDe; F, SP						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
433:2	433:6	IDE; F, SP						
434:16	434:22	IDE						
434:24	434:24	IDE						
436:1	436:15	IDE; R, 1002, BST, SP, PK	437:9	437:17	R, C			
436:16	437:4	IDE; R, 1002, BST, SP, PK	437:9	437:17	R, C			
437:5	437:8	IDE; R, 1002, BST, SP, PK	437:9	437:17	R, C			
438:13	438:18	IDE; R, 1002, BST, SP, PK	437:9	437:17	R, C			
441:22	441:25	IDE; V, R, SP, PK, BST, Arg, P	437:9 441:12 441:19	437:17 441:16 441:21	R, C, NR, PK, Spec			
442:3	442:3	IDE; V, R, SP, PK, BST, Arg, P	437:9 441:12 441:19	437:17 441:16 441:21	R, C, NR, PK, Spec			
444:22	445:5	IDE	445:14	445:17	R, C			
445:6	445:13	IDE; 1002	445:14	445:17	R, C			
446:3	446:8	IDE; 1002, SP, PK, MD, M, Arg, NE, F	445:14	445:17	R, C			
450:3	450:7	IDE; F, R						
455:23	456:6	IDE; Arg, R, SP, V, MD, M						
456:7	457:3	IDE; R, 1002, SP, PK						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
459:23	460:7	IDe; V, SP, PK, BST, LC, 701, IO, F	457:17	458:6	R, C	457:9	457:16	IDe, Cmpd, C, V, SP, 701
						458:7	458:13	IDe, V, SP
						459:6	459:9	IDe, R
460:8	460:13	IDe; SP, IO, 701, Arg, incomplete hypothetical, BST, PK, V, F	457:17	458:6	R, C	457:9	457:16	IDe, Cmpd, C, V, SP, 701
						458:7	458:13	IDe, V, SP
						459:6	459:9	IDe, R
461:2	461:15	IDe; V, SP, IO, 701, Arg, incomplete hypothetical, BST, PK, F	461:21	461:25				
462:1	462:9	IDe; V, M, F, NE, LC	462:10	462:16	F, PK, Spec	462:18	462:21	IDe, F, SP, PK
463:16	463:17	IDe; V, SP, IO, 701						
463:21	464:4	IDe; V, SP, IO, 701						
464:24	465:11	IDe; V, F, NE, SP, PK, IO, 701, Arg, M, P, incomplete hypothetical, BST, LC	457:17	458:6	R, C	457:9	457:16	IDe, Cmpd, C, V, SP, 701
						458:7	458:13	IDe, V, SP
						459:6	459:9	IDe, R
466:18	466:22	IDe; V, F, SP, IO, 701, incomplete	457:17 461:21	458:6 461:25	R, C	457:9	457:16	IDe, Cmpd, C, V, SP, 701

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		hypothetical, PK, LC				458:7	458:13	IDe, V, SP
						459:6	459:9	IDe, R
467:1	467:11	IDe; V, F, SP, IO, 701, incomplete hypothetical, PK, LC	457:17 461:21	458:6 461:25	R, C	457:9	457:16	IDe, Cmpd, C, V, SP, 701
						458:7	458:13	IDe, V, SP
						459:6	459:9	IDe, R
467:14	467:23	IDe; V, F, SP, IO, 701, incomplete hypothetical, PK, LC	457:17 461:21	458:6 461:25	R, C	457:9	457:16	IDe, Cmpd, C, V, SP, 701
						458:7	458:13	IDe, V, SP
						459:6	459:9	IDe, R
467:24	468:13	IDe; V, F, SP, IO, 701, PK, LC	457:17 461:21	458:6 461:25	R, C	457:9	457:16	IDe, Cmpd, C, V, SP, 701
						458:7	458:13	IDe, V, SP
						459:6	459:9	IDe, R
468:21	469:4	IDe; BST, F, V, SP, PK, LC, NE, IO, 701						
469:5	469:18	IDe; 1002, A	469:19	469:22				
470:18	471:15	IDe; 1002, A	469:19	469:22				
471:19	472:16	IDe; 1002, A, Arg, F, V, NE, M, MD, SP, PK, incomplete hypothetical	469:19	469:22				
472:21	473:7	IDe; 1002, A, Arg, F,	469:19	469:22				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		V, NE, M, MD, SP, PK, incomplete hypothetical						
473:8	474:15	IDe; 1002, A, V, Cmpd	469:19	469:22				
474:16	474:20	IDe; ID, 1002, A, Arg, F, V, NE, M, MD, 1002, SP, PK	469:19	469:22				
476:25	477:3	IDe	478:9	478:21	R, C, PK, Spec			
477:4	477:11	IDe; F, NE, SP, PK, V, R	478:9	478:21	R, C, PK, Spec			
477:12	477:22	IDe; F, NE, SP, PK, V, R	478:9	478:21	R, C, PK, Spec			
477:24	478:2	IDe; 1002, A	478:9	478:21	R, C, PK, Spec			
478:3	478:8	IDe; 1002, Cmpd	478:9	478:21	R, C, PK, Spec			
481:21	482:1	IDe; NT						
482:11	482:25	IDe; R, 1002, SP, PK	483:1	483:4	R, C			
483:5	483:11	IDe; R, SP, PK, F	483:1	483:4	R, C			
490:8	490:24	IDe; ID; SP; PK	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
491:7	491:10	IDe; ID; SP; PK	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
492:20	493:3	IDe; ID; SP; PK	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
493:4	493:10	IDe; ID; SP	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
493:14	493:17	IDe; V; F; SP						
493:21	493:24	IDe; V; F; SP						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
494:10	494:16	IDe; ID; SP	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
496:22	497:5	IDe; ID; V; SP; 1002	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
497:6	497:13	IDe; ID; V; SP; 1002	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
497:14	497:17	IDe; V						
497:19	498:6	IDe; ID; 1002; SP	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
499:11	500:13	IDe; ID; 1002; H; V; SP; M	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
500:20	501:4	IDe; ID; 1002; H; SP	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
502:11	502:25	IDe; ID; 1002; H; V; SP	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
503:6	503:23	IDe; ID; 1002; H; V; SP	490:25	491:6	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
504:3	504:21	IDe; ID; 1002; V; SP	490:25 504:22	491:6 505:13	R, C	492:11	492:19	IDe, ID, V, SP, PK
509:18	510:13	IDe; NT; 1002						
510:17	511:1	IDe; H; 1002						
511:9	511:20	IDe; ID; H; 1002; SP	511:2	511:8	R, C			
511:23	512:7	IDe; H; 1002; SP						
513:15	513:24	IDe; H; 1002, SP						
513:25	514:9	IDe; H; 1002; SP						
514:17	514:22	IDe; H; 1002; SP						
514:25	515:11	IDe; SP; V						
516:17	516:20	IDe; F						
518:20	518:24	IDe; F; SP; 701; IO; V						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations**Jeffery Lewis (October 25, 2017)**

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
519:3	519:7	IDe; F; SP; 701; IO; V						
519:10	519:10	IDe; F; SP; 701; IO; V						
574:1	574:4	IDe; H; 1002						
574:7	574:11	IDe; H; 1002						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
6:17	6:18							
21:12	21:16							
34:17	34:19	ID	34:20	34:21	IC, In	34:25	35:4	R, IC
34:22	34:23	ID	34:20	34:21	IC, In	34:25	35:4	R, IC
34:25	35:4	R, ID	34:20	34:21	IC, In			
36:1	36:3							
37:7	37:18	ID	37:4	37:6				
37:25	38:1	R	37:4	37:6				
38:12	38:13	R	37:4	37:6				
38:15	38:17	R						
38:18	38:22	R						
38:23	39:5	R						
39:15	39:21	R						
63:25	64:1	R, ID	64:9	64:10				
			64:14	64:15				
64:6	64:7	R, ID	64:9	64:10				
			64:14	64:15				
65:19	65:20	R, V, C, ID	66:12	66:17				
65:24	66:7	R, V, C, ID	66:12	66:17				
66:9	66:10	R, V, C, ID	66:12	66:17				
74:6	74:12	R, F, PK, SP, ID	75:13	75:14	R, P, ML	77:18	77:20	F; NE
			75:17	75:18	R, P, ML	77:18	77:20	
			75:22	75:25	R, P, ML	77:18	77:20	
			76:2	76:7	R, P, ML	77:18	77:20	

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			76:9	76:17		77:18	77:20	
77:5	77:9	R, F, V, PK, NE, SP						
79:20	79:24	R, F, SP						
80:1	80:2	R, F, SP						
80:4	80:5	V, SP						
81:1	81:5	NE, V						
82:18	82:24	F, V, SP	83:1 83:12	83:4 84:2	R, P, ML R, P, ML	84:3	84:7	V; ID
84:3	84:7	V, ID	85:11 114:16	85:16 114:19	R, P, ML	85:23 114:20	86:6 114:23	V; IC; PK; SP PK; SP
84:9	84:11	V, F, NE, SP, ID	84:14 85:11	84:18 85:16		85:23	86:6	V; IC; PK; SP
84:19	84:23	V, F, NE, SP, ID	84:14 85:11	84:16 85:16		85:23	86:6	V; IC; PK; SP
85:23	86:1	V, ID	85:11 114:16	85:16 114:19	R, P, ML	114:20	114:23	PK; SP
86:2	86:6	PK, SP, V, ID	83:12	84:2	R, P, ML	84:3	84:7	V; IC
86:9	86:17	ID	87:11 108:23	87:23 109:15	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	87:25 87:25	88:7 88:7	F, NE, SP, IC
87:25	88:7	F, NE, SP, ID	91:6 108.23	91:16 109:15	F, V, Spec	106:24 110:5	107:5 110:16	V, F, NE, SP, PK, P F, V, H, PK, SP
92:5	92:12	V, ID	91:6	91:16		106:24 110:5	107:5 110:16	V, F, NE, SP, PK, P F, V, H, PK, SP

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			91:25	92:4	F, V, Spec	104:2	104:10	V; NE; F; PK; SP
92:13	92:23	ID	91:25 92:24	92:4 93:5	F, V, Spec	93:10	93:17	IC; V; M; F
97:18	97:22	Cmpd, F, NE						
97:24	97:25	Cmpd, F, NE						
98:3	98:4	V, Cmpd						
98:7	98:11	V, Cmpd						
105:1	105:5	V, SP, NE, F	105:6	105:9		110:5 104:2	110:16 104:10	F, V, H, PK, SP V; NE; F; PK; SP
106:24	107:3	V, F, NE, SP, PK, P, ID	106:1 106:7	106:2 106:10	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	279:13 279:13	279:22 279:22	R, SP, PK, NE, V, F, P, H, IC (for all)
107:4	107:5	V, F, NE, SP, PK, P, ID	106:1 106:7	106:2 106:10	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	279:13 281:22 282:14 279:13 281:22 282:14	279:22 281:25 282:25 279:22 281:25 282:25	R, SP, PK, NE, V, F, P, H, IC (279:13-22) R, NE, F, IC (281:22-25) V (282:14-25) R, SP, PK, NE, V, F, P, H, IC (279:13-22)
110:5	110:6	F, V, H, PK, SP						
110:7	110:8	F, V, H, PK, SP						
110:9	110:16	F, V, H, PK, SP, ID	108:23	109:15	F, V, Spec			
110:20	111:1	V, PK, SP, P, ID	108:23	109:15	F, V, Spec			
113:2	113:4	ID, F, NE, SP, PK, M	113:5	113:6	V, Spec	116:4	116:12	F, SP, PK, H, V, IC

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			113:13	113:21	F, V, Spec	116:16	116:18	F, SP, PK, H, V, IC
113:7	113:11	ID, F, NE, SP, PK, M	113:5 113:13	113:6 113:21	H	116:4 116:16	116:12 116:18	F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC
113:22	113:25	ID, H, F, NE, SP, PK, M	114:2	114:2				
114:4	114:7	ID, H, F, NE, SP, PK, M	114:2	114:2				
115:10	115:13	H, F, SP, PK, ID	85:11 114:16 115:14	85:16 114:19 115:17	P, R, ML H	85:23 114:20 116:4 116:16	86:6 114:23 116:12 116:18	V; ID; PK; SP PK; SP F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC
116:11	116:12	F, SP, PK, H, V, ID	115:18 115:23	115:20 115:25	F, V, Spec, C, PK F, V, Spec, C, PK	116:4 116:16 116:4 116:16	116:12 116:18 116:12 116:18	F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC
116:16	116:18	F, SP, PK, H, V, ID	115:18 115:23	115:20 115:25	F, V, Spec, C, PK F, V, Spec, C, PK	116:4 116:16 116:4 116:16	116:12 116:18 116:12 116:18	F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC
116:22	117:3	F, SP, PK, H, V, ID	115:18 115:23	115:20 115:25	F, V, Spec, C, PK F, V, Spec, C, PK	116:4 116:16 116:4 116:16	116:12 116:18 116:12 116:18	F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
117:4	117:6	ID, F, NE, SP, PK, H, V, M	117:7	117:8				
117:9	117:11	ID, F, NE, SP, PK, H, V, M	117:7	117:8				
117:13	118:2	F, NE, SP, PK, H, V, M, L, ID	117:7 115:18 115:23	117:8 115:20 115:25	F, V, Spec, C, PK F, V, Spec, C, PK	116:4 116:16 116:4 116:16	116:12 116:18 116:12 116:18	F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC F, SP, PK, H, V, IC
118:18	118:20	ID, F, SP, PK	118:24	119:1				
119:2	119:5	ID, F, SP, PK	118:24	119:1				
127:1	127:5	NE, F, SP, PK, V, M, ID, 1002	125:18	126:15				
127:7	127:11	F, MD, SP, PK, ID, 1002	125:18	126:15				
127:15	127:20	F, MD, SP, PK, 1002, ID	125:18	126:15				
128:22	128:23	ID, PK, SP, F, M	128:11 129:1	128:20 129:2		129:24 130:9	130:1 130:12	F; V; SP; PK; IC F; V; SP; PK; IC
129:3	129:4	ID, PK, SP, F	128:11 129:1	128:20 129:2		129:24 130:9	130:1 130:12	F; V; SP; PK; IC F; V; SP; PK; IC
129:6	129:12	PK, SP, R, F, NE, ID	128:11	128:20		129:24	130:1	F; V; SP; PK; IC

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			129:1	129:2		130:9	130:12	F; V; SP; PK; IC
144:5	144:11	ID, V, SP, PK, R	143:7 143:13 144:12 144:21 145:3	143:10 144:4 144:19 144:25 145:7	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec F, V, Spec F, V, Spec F, V, Spec	164:9 164:9 164:9 164:9 164:9	164:13 164:13 164:13 164:13 164:13	R, V, SP, F (for all)
151:14	151:17	SP, PK, ID, R	151:21 151:2	151:22 151:8	F, V, Spec	164:25 164:25	165:6 165:6	F; V; SP; PK (for all)
151:25	152:2	SP, PK, ID, R	151:21 151:2	151:22 151:8	F, V, Spec	164:25 164:25	165:6 165:6	F; V; SP; PK (for all)
154:6	154:12	R, SP, PK, F, V, NE, ID, P	153:1 153:9	153:5 154:5	ML, R, P, Char, NR ML, R, P, Char, NR			
164:9	164:13	R, V, SP, F						
166:6	166:8	F, V, NE, SP						
166:12	166:17	F, V, NE, SP						
167:6	167:7	F, V, NE, F, SP						
167:13	167:16	F, V, NE, F, SP, ID	167:18 167:25	167:22 169:4	F, V, Spec F, P, V, ML			
169:7	169:8	F, SP, PK, V						
169:13	169:16	F, SP, PK, V						
169:18	169:23	F, SP, PK, V						
170:17	170:20	F, SP, PK, V, NE, P, ID	171:5	171:8				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
170:24	171:2	F, SP, PK, V, NE, P, ID	171:5	171:8				
172:3	172:5	ID, SP, V	172:6	172:8				
172:10	172:15	ID, SP, V, PK	172:6 172:16	172:8 172:19				
173:11	173:14	M, F, V, NE, ID	173:20	173:23				
173:17	173:18	M, F, V, NE, ID	173:20	173:23				
174:15	174:19	R, SP, V, ID	174:20	174:24				
174:25	175:2	F, NE, SP, PK, ID	174:20	174:24				
175:5	175:7	F, NE, SP, PK, ID	174:20	174:24				
175:9	175:14	F, NE, SP, PK, V	174:20	174:24				
176:25	177:4	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V						
177:8	177:8	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V, ID	177:11 177:16	177:13 177:20	F, V, PK, Spec F, V, PK, Spec, P	187:3 187:3	187:15 187:15	IC; V IC; V
187:3	187:7	ID, V	187:1	187:1				
187:8	187:15	ID, V	187:16 188:8	188:4 188:13	F, Spec, PK F, Spec, PK	176:25 177:8 176:25 177:8	177:4 177:8 176:25 177:8	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V F, M, NE, SP, PK, V F, M, NE, SP, PK, V F, M, NE, SP, PK, V
210:8	210:12	ID	210:13	210:15	F, Spec, V			
211:11	211:15	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	211:16 212:15 212:25 213:7	211:21 212:20 213:4 213:10	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			213:12	213:18	F, Spec			
211:22	211:25	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec , R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec			
212:1	212:5	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec , R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec			
212:10	212:14	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec			
216:14	216:21	NT						
216:24	217:2	ID, 1002	217:3	217:9	F, V, Spec			
241:16	241:19	M, V, R, ID	241:23	242:13	F, Spec			
249:23	250:6	NT, 1002						
260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			261:6	261:9	R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC			
261:25	262:5	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC			
264:18	264:24	NT, 1002						
265:5	265:10	H, 1002						
266:17	266:22	F, V, R, SP						
267:11	267:13	V, SP, H, 1002, ID	267:14	267:15				
268:13	269:1	P, R, H, 1002						
270:12	270:16	H, R, P, ID	272:16	272:20	D			
277:21	278:2	R, SP, PK, NE, V, F, P						
279:13	279:22	R, SP, PK, NE, V, F, P, H, ID	279:23 280:9	280:6 281:4	Spec, P, F Spec, P, F, C	282:14 282:14	282:25 282:25	V V
281:22	281:25	R, NE, F, ID	281:5	281:21	Spec, P, F, C	282:14	282:25	V

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
282:14	282:17	V						
289:6	289:8	F, NE, Arg, R, SP, PK, V, H, 1002, LC, P						
289:11	289:16	R, V, F, 1002, SP, NE, MD, P, ID	284:14 284:22	284:18 285:25	F, Spec, P, C F, Spec, P, C	282:14 282:14	282:25 282:25	V V
291:16	291:19	ID, SP, IO, 701, V, R, P, LC, F, NE, PK	291:14	291:15	Spec, F, V, IC			
291:23	292:4	ID, SP, IO, 701, V, R, P, LC, F, NE, PK	291:14	291:15	Spec, F, V, IC			
292:21	292:23	ID, SP, IO, 701, V, R, P, LC, F, NE, PK	292:20	292:20	F, IC			
293:1	293:2	ID, SP, IO, 701, V, R, P, LC, F, NE, PK	292:20	292:20				
293:19	294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC						
294:6	294:14	A, PK, SP, ID, 1002	294:15	294:21	IC, AT			
294:22	295:1	ID, A, PK, SP, H, 1002	294:15	294:21	IC, AT			
295:9	295:15	ID, A, R, H	295:2 295:16 296:13	295:8 296:1 296:19	R, NR	293:19 293:19	294:1 294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC (for all)
296:6	296:7	ID, A, R, H	295:2 295:16	295:8 296:1	R, NR	293:19 293:19	294:1 294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC (for all)

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			296:13	296:19				
296:9	296:11	ID, A, R, H	295:2 295:16 296:13	295:8 296:1 296:19	R, NR	293:19 293:19	294:1 294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC (for all)
298:7	298:25	R, P, M, MD, H, PK, 1002, ID, SP	298:3 294:8	298:6 294:9				
299:7	299:12	NT, 1002						
299:19	299:24	NE, MD, R, P, SP, PK, F, H, ID, 1002	299:25	301:1	F, Spec, V, Char	301:2 301:9	301:4 301:13	F; V; NE; SP F; V; NE; SP
305:22	306:5	NT, 1002						
306:6	306:8							
306:18	306:23	SP, PK, R, P, F, NE, V						
312:7	312:11	PK, SP, NE, F, R						
312:12	312:17	F, SP, 1002, ID, PK	312:25 313:7	313:2 313:10	F, Spec, PK F, Spec, PK			
312:19	312:23	F, SP, PK, ID	312:25 313:7	313:2 313:10	F, Spec, PK F, Spec, PK			
313:18	313:25	NE, F, SP, PK, H, 1002						
314:1	314:8	R, P, F, ID	315:1 315:7 315:13	315:3 315:10 315:19	V, Spec V, Spec V, Spec	293:19 293:19 293:19	294:1 294:1 294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC (for all)
315:20	315:22	V, SP, PK, IO, LC,	315:1	315:3	V, Spec	293:19	294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP,

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		R, P, F, NE, ID	315:7 315:13	315:10 315:19	V, Spec V, Spec	293:19 293:19	294:1 294:1	PK, LC (for all)
315:25	315:25	V, SP, PK, IO, LC, R, P, F, NE, ID	315:1 315:7 315:13	315:3 315:10 315:19	V, Spec V, Spec V, Spec	293:19 293:19 293:19	294:1 294:1 294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC (for all)
315:25	316:2	V, SP, PK, IO, LC, R, P, F, NE, ID	315:1 315:7 315:13	315:3 315:10 315:19	V, Spec V, Spec V, Spec	293:19 293:19 293:19	294:1 294:1 294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC (for all)
329:19	329:22	NT, 1002						
329:24	330:2	NT, H, 1002						
330:3	330:15	NT, 1002						
330:23	331:4	R						
331:7	331:13	R						
348:13	348:22	R, C, P, ID	349:22	349:24				
348:25	349:21	R, C, P, ID	349:22	349:24				
351:17	351:19	H, R, C, SP, F, NE, ID, P	352:2	352:4				
352:6	352:10	H, R, C, SP, F, NE, ID, P	352:2	352:4				
353:16	353:24	H, R, C, F, NE, P						
354:12	354:14	F, SP, NE, R, C, P						
354:17	354:18	F, SP, NE, R, C, P						
357:4	357:12	R, C, P						
359:18	360:4	R, C, SP, PK, P						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
360:6	360:9	R, C, SP, PK, P						
361:20	362:5	R, C, SP, PK, V						
366:14	366:16	V, SP, R, C, ID	365:23 366:2	365:23 366:3	Spec, F, V, R, Char Spec, F, V, R, Char			
366:18	366:19	V, SP, R, C, ID	365:23 366:2	365:23 366:3	Spec, F, V, R, Char Spec, F, V, R, Char			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jarron Merrill (February 22, 2018)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
7:15	7:22							
9:2	9:9	ID	9:10	9:10				
17:24	18:2	R, C, P						
18:6	18:6	R, C, P						
18:16	19:2	SP, PK						
19:6	20:2	SP, PK						
20:6	20:8	SP, PK						
20:11	21:3	SP, PK						
21:7	21:9	SP, PK						
116:23	117:15	SP, PK, A, 1002	124:9 124:16	124:12 124:17	R, C, P	124:18	124:21	V, PK, R
135:11	136:3	PK, SP, A, 1002	131:19 133:11 134:5 134:12	133:8 134:2 134:10 134:22	R, C, P			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
6:9	6:10							
56:14	57:2	R, F, ID, PK	57:3	58:3	F, PK, Spec			
58:4	58:5	R, SP, PK, V	57:3	58:3	F, PK, Spec			
58:9	58:13	R, SP, PK, V	57:3	58:3	F, PK, Spec			
58:15	59:9	R, SP, PK	57:3	58:3	F, PK, Spec			
63:6	63:13	Cmpd, V, R, PK, H						
63:20	64:9	PK, H, R, SP	64:10	64:17				
66:25	67:3	F, SP, PK, R						
76:7	76:16	F, SP, PK, ID	76:19	76:23	R, Spec			
76:17	76:18	F, SP, PK, ID	76:19	76:23	R, Spec			
79:1	79:9	F, ID, PK, SP	69:21 79:10 79:13 79:15	70:1 79:11 79:13 79:17	R	69:5 79:18	69:20 80:12	IC R; V; SP
80:14	80:19	F, SP, V, M						
80:25	81:2	R, F, ID, P, NR	81:3	81:10	R, P	81:11 82:2	81:21 82:9	R; SP R;SP
84:22	85:5	ID, F, SP, V	84:13 85:6	84:21 85:15	C			
85:18	86:16	ID, SP, F, PK, C, V	85:6 86:17	85:15 86:19				
86:22	87:3	F, SP, PK, NE	87:4	87:14	F, PK, Spec	87:15 87:20	87:17 87:23	
88:14	88:19	PK, SP, Cmpd, V, NE	87:25	88:13	F, PK, H	87:15	87:17	

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			88:20	89:15		87:20	87:23	
89:16	89:20	V, PK, SP						
90:5	91:3	R, SP, NE, LD						
91:6	92:1	R, V, SP, PK, NE						
93:10	93:16	R, ID, V, SP	93:7	93:9				
93:18	94:2	R						
94:17	95:8	R, SP, Cmpd	96:6	96:11	R, C			
95:15	95:18	R						
96:20	96:22	R, V, ID, PK	96:23	97:3	R, C			
97:4	97:9	R, V, SP, PK, ID	96:23	97:3	R, C			
98:13	98:16	R, V, PK, SP						
100:1	100:11	R, SP, PK						
100:12	101:9	R, SP, PK						
102:21	102:24	ID, R, V	102:9 102:14 102:25	102:11 102:17 103:3	F, PK, Spec	101:18 101:25 203:2	101:21 102:5 203:22	M; NE; F; SP; PK M; NE; F; SP; PK 1002; R
103:8	104:1	ID, R, V, SP	103:5 102:25	103:7 103:3	F, PK, Spec	101:18 101:25 203:2	101:21 102:5 203:22	M; NE; F; SP; PK M; NE; F; SP; PK 1002; R
104:17	104:22	R, SP						
104:23	105:4	SP, PK, NE, LD, F						
105:5	105:12	NE, LD, R, LC, F						
105:13	106:1	F, PK, R						
106:3	106:8	ID, V, SP	106:9	106:9				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
106:10	106:15	ID, V, SP	106:9	106:9				
106:18	106:24	SP, F, PK, V						
106:25	107:3	SP, F, NE, LD						
108:5	108:7	ID, SP, V	108:8	108:11	R			
108:13	109:22	ID, PK	108:8 109:25 110:6	108:11 110:3 110:24	R, C, PK, Spec			
111:2	111:19	ID, SP, PK, V	110:6	110:24	R, C, PK, Spec			
114:2	114:14	NR, V, Cmpd, SP, NE. LD, LC						
115:4	115:13	ID, SP, PK, V	116:4	116:22		203:2	203:22	1002; R
115:14	116:3	ID, V, SP, PK	116:4	116:22		203:2	203:22	1002; R
116:23	117:1	ID, SP, PK, V	116:4	116:22		203:2	203:22	1002; R
117:2	117:5	ID, SP, PK, V	116:4	116:22		203:2	203:22	1002; R
117:17	117:20	ID, PK, V, NR	118:23	119:10	R, C	119:11	119:12	IC; SP; PK
118:7	118:22	ID, R	118:23	119:10	R, C	119:16	119:23	IC; SP; PK
119:25	120:17	IP, SP, F, PK, V	118:23	119:10	R, C	119:16	119:23	IC; SP; PK
120:18	121:4	IP, SP, F, PK, NE. LD, LC	118:23	119:10	R, C	119:16	119:23	IC; SP; PK
121:5	121:12	IP, SP, F, PK, LC, NR	118:23	119:10	R, C	119:16	119:23	IC; SP; PK
121:13	121:16	IP, SP, F, PK, LC	118:23 121:17	119:10 121:21	R, C	119:16	119:23	IC; SP; PK
121:22	123:4	IP, SP, F, PK	118:23 123:5	119:10 123:23	R, C, F, PK, Spec	119:16	119:23	IC; SP; PK

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
123:25	124:8	ID, A, PK, NT	124:9 128:19 138:21 139:2	124:10 130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
124:15	124:18	ID, PK, SP	124:9 128:19 138:21 139:2	124:10 130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
124:22	125:9	ID, SP, F, PK	128:19 138:21 139:2	130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
125:12	125:24	ID, SP, F, PK	123:5 128:19 138:21 139:2	123:23 130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
126:14	126:18	ID, R	123:5	123:23	F, PK, Spec			
126:19	126:23	ID, V, SP, PK	123:5 128:19 138:21 139:2	123:23 130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
127:2	127:9	ID, SP, F, PK	123:5 128:19 138:21 139:2	123:23 130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
127:10	127:18	ID, V, SP, LF, NR	123:5	123:23	R, F, PK, Spec			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			128:19 138:21 139:2	130:18 138:24 139:8				
127:19	128:12	ID, SP, LF, SP, PK	123:5 128:19 138:21 139:2	123:23 130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
130:19	131:10	ID, V, SP, PK	128:19 132:2 132:7 138:21 139:2	130:18 132:4 132:7 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec	132:15	132:18	F; SP; PK
134:15	134:18	ID, R, V, SP, LF, PK	123:5	123:23	F, PK, Spec			
134:24	136:4	ID, R, V, SP, LF, PK	123:5	123:23	F, PK, Spec			
136:5	136:18	R, V, SP, LF, PK, ID	128:19 138:21 139:2	130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
139:10	139:12	SP, PK, ID	128:19 138:21 139:2	130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
139:16	139:17	SP, PK, ID	128:19 138:21 139:2	130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
139:18	139:20	SP, PK, ID	128:19 138:21	130:18 138:24	R, F, PK, Spec			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			139:2	139:8				
139:24	140:16	SP, PK, ID	128:19 138:21 139:2	130:18 138:24 139:8	R, F, PK, Spec			
141:1	141:4	ID, R	138:21 139:2 140:19 142:16 142:22	138:24 139:8 140:25 142:19 142:24	R, C			
143:2	143:3	SP, PK, ID, H	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24				
143:5	143:5	SP, PK, ID, H	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24				
146:9	146:18	SP, V, R	147:1	147:5				
149:11	149:12	ID, SP, V	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24				
149:17	150:3	ID, PK, SP, V	138:21 139:2 142:16	138:24 139:8 142:19				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			142:22	142:24				
150:19	150:23	SP, V, PK						
150:24	151:2	M, SP, PK						
151:6	151:16	M, SP, PK						
153:22	154:1	R						
154:22	154:24	PK, NT						
155:2	155:24	PK, ID, NT, SP	156:17	156:24	R	156:8 156:14	156:11 156:15	F; SP; PK; 1002 F; SP; PK; 1002
156:2	156:7	SP, PK, ID, SP	156:17	156:24	R	156:8 156:14	156:11 156:15	F; SP; PK; 1002 F; SP; PK; 1002
156:25	157:21	SP, PK, ID	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
157:22	157:25	ID, SP, PK	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
158:5	158:13	ID, SP, PK	138:21 139:2 142:16	138:24 139:8 142:19	R, C			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			142:22 161:16 162:3	142:24 161:23 162:11				
159:9	159:11	ID, M, PK	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
159:14	159:22	ID, M, PK	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
160:2	160:7	SP, PK						
160:8	161:7	SP, PK						
161:8	161:10	ID, SP, PK	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
161:14	161:15	ID, SP, PK	138:21 139:2	138:24 139:8	R, C			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11				
162:22	162:24	ID, SP, PK, M	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
163:2	163:2	ID, SP, PK, M	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
163:4	163:17	ID, SP, PK, M	138:21 139:2 142:16 142:22 161:16 162:3	138:24 139:8 142:19 142:24 161:23 162:11	R, C			
163:21	163:21	ID, SP, PK, M	138:21 139:2 142:16	138:24 139:8 142:19	R, C			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			142:22 161:16 162:3	142:24 161:23 162:11				
164:13	164:19	PK, SP, NR						
172:17	173:5	F, LD						
173:16	174:6	R, PK						
174:7	174:16	P, PK						
180:6	180:10	ID, PK, NT	180:11	180:14				
180:15	181:15	ID, PK	180:11	180:14				
183:16	184:9	SP, PK, ID, MD	123:5 182:19	123:23 183:15	F, PK, Spec	181:16 203:2	182:12 203:22	V; F; SP 1002: R
184:10	185:19	SP, ID, R						
185:20	185:24	SP, PK, R, MD	185:25	186:12	C	181:16 186:19	182:12 187:17	V; F; SP 1002; R
186:13	186:18	SP, PK, Cmpd	185:25	186:12	C	181:16 186:19 203:2	182:12 187:17 203:22	V; F; SP 1002: R 1002; R
188:5	188:14	NT, ID						
188:19	188:22	1002, R						
189:15	190:3	ID, SP, PK	190:11 190:16 196:15	190:12 190:16 196:22	R			
190:5	190:10	ID, SP, PK	190:11 190:16 196:15	190:12 190:16 196:22	R			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
191:25	192:3	ID, PK	192:4	192:5	R, C			
192:6	192:13	ID, PK, SP	192:4	192:5	R, C			
193:7	193:14	PK, ID	196:15	196:22	IC, F, PK, Spec			
193:23	194:1	SP, PK, ID	196:15	196:22	IC, F, PK, Spec			
200:1	200:6	R						
200:7	200:11	R, SP						
200:20	200:22	R	200:25	201:5	C			
204:23	205:5	ID, SP, NR	84:17 85:6 110:6 205:14 205:24	84:21 85:15 110:24 205:20 206:11	R, C, PK, Spec	206:13	206:17	F; NE; SP
205:6	205:13	ID, M	84:17 85:6 110:6 205:14 205:24	84:21 85:15 110:24 205:20 206:11	R, C, PK, Spec	206:13	206:17	F; NE; SP
208:2	208:10	R, V, SP, PK						
208:13	208:22	R, V, SP, PK						
209:2	209:18	R, V, SP, PK, ID	208:1 208:13	208:10 208:15	C			
209:19	209:25	R, V, SP, PK, ID	208:1 208:13 210:5 210:10	208:10 208:15 210:6 210:10	C			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
210:24	211:2	R, V, SP, PK, ID	208:1 208:13	208:10 208:15				
211:4	211:15	R, V, SP, PK, ID	208:1 208:13	208:10 208:15				
212:8	212:18	SP, Cmpd, V, SP						
220:25	221:2	PK, ID, LC, SP	221:3	221:7	R, P			
228:15	228:20	R, ID, LC, SP	229:5 238:15	229:7 239:25	IC, R, P, ML, F, Spec, LC, 701	228:24	229:1	IC; F; V; SP; Incomplete hypothetical
233:17	233:22	LC, NT						
234:8	234:14	LC, ID, 1002	234:15	235:2	R, C, P, ML, F, Spec, LC, 701			
235:3	236:12	LC, ID, SP, PK, H	234:15 236:13	235:2 240:8	R, C, P, ML, F, Spec, LC, 701			
240:9	240:15	LC, ID	240:16 241:18 241:21	240:25 241:19 241:23	R, P, F, PK, Spec, ML	240:25	241:8	1002; P; R
242:6	242:24	LD, ID, SP, PK	240:16 241:18 241:21	240:25 241:19 241:23	R, P, F, PK, Spec, ML	240:25	241:8	1002; P; R
243:22	244:4	LC, ID	244:9 246:9 246:15	245:1 246:12 246:19	R, P, F, Spec			
244:5	244:8	LC, ID	244:9 246:9	245:1 246:12	R, P, F, Spec			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			246:15	246:19				
245:19	246:8	SP, PK, ID	244:9 246:9 246:15	245:1 246:12 246:19	R, P, F, Spec			
247:16	247:18	SP, PK, ID, LC	247:9	247:13	ML			
247:22	247:23	SP, PK, ID, LC						
260:17	260:24	NT, R						
261:1	261:13							
263:16	265:13	R, P, ID	57:3 265:14 266:14 284:15	58:3 266:1 267:11 284:21	R, C, F, PK, Spec			
266:2	266:13	R, P, ID	57:3 265:14 266:14 284:15	58:3 266:1 267:11 284:21	R, C, F, PK, Spec, AT, ML			
280:18	281:8	R, P, ID	57:3 265:14 266:14 284:15	58:3 266:1 267:11 284:21	R, C, F, PK, Spec, AT, ML			
281:11	281:12	R, P, ID	57:3 265:14 266:14 284:15	58:3 266:1 267:11 284:21	R, C, F, PK, Spec, AT, ML			
281:14	281:16	R, P, ID	57:3	58:3	R, C, F, PK, Spec,			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			265:14 266:14 284:15	266:1 267:11 284:21	AT, ML			
281:18	281:19	R, P, ID	57:3 265:14 266:14 284:15	58:3 266:1 267:11 284:21	R, C, F, PK, Spec, AT, ML			
281:21	282:2	R, P, ID	57:3 265:14 266:14 284:15	58:3 266:1 267:11 284:21	R, C, F, PK, Spec, AT, ML			
282:4	282:8	R, P, ID	57:3 265:14 266:14 284:15	58:3 266:1 267:11 284:21	R, C, F, PK, Spec, AT, ML			
284:22	285:3	R, P, ID	284:15	285:21	R, C, AT, MIL			
291:5	291:14	ID, NT, R	291:24	292:4				
291:18	291:23	ID, SP, PK, LD	291:24	292:4				
292:5	293:6	ID, SP, PK, LD	291:24 294:17	292:4 295:5				
293:13	293:25	ID, 1002, R	294:17	295:5				
302:13	302:17	NT						
302:20	303:6	SP, NR, R						
303:7	303:10	R, P, SP						
303:14	304:4	R, P						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Magnus Olson (December 1, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
304:7	304:17	R, P, SD, PK, H						
305:9	305:18	R, P						
305:19	306:5	R, P, SP, PK						
306:24	307:10	R, P						
307:11	307:13	R, P						
307:14	308:11	R, P						
308:16	308:19	R, P						
308:22	308:25	R, P						
309:2	309:13	R, P, SP						
309:20	309:25	R, P						
310:1	310:8	R, P, SP, V						
310:11	310:11	R, P						
312:22	313:1	NT						
313:8	314:9							

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jason Pawlik (December 5, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
5:8	5:13							
7:4	7:11		7:15	7:17		7:18	8:7	R, V
22:5	22:15	ID	22:16 23:8	22:19 23:10		23:11	23:12	
27:7	27:12	ID, V, F	27:2	27:4		26:21	27:1	
28:5	28:13	ID						
29:6	29:25	SP, R						
30:12	30:17	ID	30:18	30:23				
30:24	31:2	V, PK, R						
33:23	34:1	ID, V, Cmpd						
34:11	35:5	V, ID	35:6	35:14		35:25 36:3 36:5	36:1 36:3 36:6	V, NE, IC V, NE, IC IC
47:25	48:15	ID, PK, F, A, SP, H, 1002	48:19	48:21		48:25 48:17	49:6 48:17	IC, R R
52:16	52:19	ID, PK, F, A, R	52:20	52:21		52:22 53:4	53:4 54:9	R, MD AT, R
53:16	53:18	D, PK, F, A, SP, R	52:20	52:21		52:22 53:4	53:4 54:9	R, MD AT, R
54:25	55:5		54:12	54:24	AT			
62:22	62:25	ID, PK, F	62:13	62:21	IC, P, R, In	63:1	63:3	
63:6	63:12	PK, F, SP, R, Cmpd						
70:1	70:7	ID, PK, SP, F, V, R	69:12	69:25	R, P			
86:12	86:15	ID, PK, SP, F, A,	85:17	86:3	P			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jason Pawlik (December 5, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		Cmpd	86:4 86:10	86:8 86:10				
91:21	91:24	ID, A, 1002	39:6 92:8 93:14	39:20 92:25 93:18	AT			
95:15	96:2		39:6 92:8 93:14 96:3	39:20 92:25 93:18 96:8	AT			
96:9	96:11	ID, F, V						
97:5	97:16	ID, PK, F, A, Cmpd, SP						
97:18	98:10	V, ID, PK, SP, F, A, Cmpd						
99:18	99:25	ID, V, F, SP, PK	99:12	99:17				
111:13	111:21	1002						
112:7	112:22	NR, PK, H, 1002						
113:3	113:12	ID, V, H, R, F, 1002	113:25	114:19		113:13 113:18 114:20	113:15 113:18 115:4	M, R R R
115:25	116:2	V, ID	115:12	115:24				
118:20	119:2	ID, F, H, 1002						
120:24	121:2	ID, M, H, V, F, 1002	120:16 120:20	120:17 120:22	R, P, In	120:12	120:13	MD, IC

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jason Pawlik (December 5, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
121:5	121:8	1002, H, V, F	120:16 120:20	120:17 120:22	R, P, In	120:12	120:13	MD, IC
121:15	121:17		121:24	122:15		122:20	122:24	
122:16	122:19	H; 1002	126:10	127:2	H	127:6	127:10	IC, V, R, PK
123:7	123:12	ID; 1002; H; V	126:10	127:2	H	127:6	127:10	IC, V, R, PK
124:1	124:4	H; 1002; V; Cmpd; PK	124:5	124:9		123:13	123:21	IC, V, H, 1002
124:10	124:22	ID; V; H; 1002; F	126:10	127:2	H	127:6	127:10	IC, V, R, PK
127:14	127:16	1002, H, V, F						
129:10	130:11	ID, R, PK, SP, V, LD	130:12 130:15 131:1 131:7 131:15	130:13 130:24 131:5 131:8 131:17				
131:19	132:3	ID, 1002, H, LD	130:21 131:7 131:15 133:20	131:5 131:8 131:17 134:10				
134:11	134:13	ID, V, MD, H, 1002, LD, P, F						
134:17	134:19	ID, V, MD, H, 1002, LD, P, F						
134:21	136:8	SP, PK, V, H, MD, M, LD, Arg, ID	39:11	39:20	IC, P, R			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jason Pawlik (December 5, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
137:12	139:2	ID, V, 1002, H, LD, R						
139:15	139:18	ID, F, SP, LD, PK, V, R						
139:20	139:21	ID, F, SP, LD, PK, V, R						
140:1	141:3	1002, H, PK, LD, SP, R, V	126:10	127:2	IC	127:6	127:10	IC, V, R, PK
141:7	141:14	ID, LD, SP, PK, V						
141:25	143:2	ID, PK, SP, R, V	143:3 143:11 143:16	143:6 143:14 143:19	AT			
144:10	144:14	ID, SP, PK, F, A	144:15	144:17				
144:18	144:24	F, A, 1002, H, PK	144:15	144:17				
147:21	147:24							
148:16	148:21	H, 1002, ID, PK, F, A	148:22	148:25	P, R	149:1	149:6	IC, R, 1002, PK
149:7	149:10	ID, A, 1002, H, SP, PK	148:22	148:25	P, R	149:1	149:6	IC, R, 1002, PK
149:13	149:16	F, A, 1002, PK, SP	148:22	148:25	P, R	149:1	149:6	IC, R, 1002, PK
150:18	151:7	1002, H, A, F						
153:6	153:20	ID, PK, F, A	153:1 153:25	153:5 154:1	IN, R, P	152:17 152:25	152:24 152:25	R, 1002, V IC
153:22	153:22		153:1 153:25	153:5 154:1	IN, R, P	152:17 152:25	152:24 152:25	R, 1002, V IC
154:7	154:17	F, A, 1002, H, SP, ID,	153:25	154:1	IN, R, P, NR			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jason Pawlik (December 5, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		PK, M, MD						
154:20	154:20							
154:23	155:1	ID, PK, F, A	155:2	155:4				
155:5	155:9	F, A, ID, PK, 1002, H	155:2	155:4				
156:7	156:17	ID, PK, F, A, 1002, H, SP						
156:22	157:4	ID, PK, SP, 1002, H, F, A	157:6	157:6				
157:7	157:7	PK, SP, 1002, H, F, A, ID	157:6	157:6				
169:3	169:14	ID, R, Cmpd, V, R	168:24	169:2				
169:16	169:18							
181:13	181:18	ID, M, V, PK, Cmpd	181:9	181:12				
181:20	181:21							
182:12	182:15	ID, F, SP, PK, V	182:16 182:20	182:18 182:20	F, Spec, PK			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
8:12	8:15							
14:8	14:16							
15:12	15:20							
16:22	17:16							
19:5	19:10							
20:5	20:6	R, BST						
20:8	20:19	R, BST						
21:23	22:2							
26:1	26:2	R, M						
26:4	26:6	R, M						
26:18	26:25	R, M						
27:2	27:3	R	30:13 30:20	30:14 30:24				
27:15	27:17	R						
36:23	37:5	R						
37:23	38:2	R, LD						
38:4	38:9	R, F,						
38:10	38:21	R, F, SP, PK						
38:22	38:25	R, F, SP, PK						
39:2	39:8	R, F,	40:3 40:8 42:15	40:5 40:11 43:2	P, R	40:12 43:3	40:24 43:10	R, M, F, PK R, M, F, PK
45:1	45:22	R, F,	45:23	46:22		47:13	48:4	R, M, F, PK
58:20	58:21	R, F, NR	59:3	59:24		59:25	60:10	R, M, F, H

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						86:3 86:11	86:9 86:13	R, M, F R, M, F
58:23	59:2	R, F, NR	59:3	59:24		59:25 86:3 86:11	60:10 86:9 86:13	R, M, F, PK R, M, F, PK R, M, F, PK
76:2	77:5	R, 1002, NT, H						
83:15	83:22							
83:24	83:25							
92:18	92:23	R, F, LD	92:24 95:6 97:6 97:10	93:7 95:13 97:8 97:14		95:16	95:25	R, M, F
93:8	94:13	R, F, LD	92:24 95:6 97:6 97:10	93:7 95:13 97:8 97:14	P, R	95:16	95:25	R, M, F
97:16	97:25	R, F	98:1 95:6 97:6 97:10	98:25 95:13 97:8 97:14	P, R	95:16 99:1	95:25 99:5	R, M, F R, M, F
103:24	104:5	R, NR, 1002						
104:23	105:18	R, NR, 1002						
106:4	106:7	R	106:8	107:5	P, R	108:5	108:10	R, M, F

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			107:7	108:4		108:22	109:1	R, M, F
108:13	108:16	R	109:31	109:21	P, R, NR			R, M, F
110:19	110:22	R	110:23 111:25 112:4	111:14 112:2 112:13	P, R, NR, O, LF, L, 701, PK	111:15	111:22	R, M, F, PK
113:12	113:21	R, H, F, PK, SP, NR	113:22	114:2				
114:19	114:22	R, H, F, PK						
114:23	115:8	R, H, F, PK						
115:12	116:1	R, H, F, PK						
121:24	122:5	R, F, PK, 1002						
122:12	122:17	R, F, PK, 1002						
122:24	123:7	R, F, NT, 1002	124:8 124:21 126:13	124:16 125:3 127:3	P, R, IC, ML			
123:10	124:7	R, F, NT, 1002	124:8 124:21 126:13	124:16 125:3 127:3	P, R, IC, ML			
132:13	133:8	R	133:9	133:17	L	133:18 134:1 134:3	133:23 134:1 134:7	R, M, F, PK R, M, F, PK R, M, F, PK
137:13	137:19	R, ID	137:10	137:12				
137:20	137:21	R, ID	137:10	137:12				
137:23	137:24	R, ID	137:10	137:12				
138:1	138:14	R, ID	137:10	137:12				

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
138:15	138:20	R, ID	137:10	137:12				
140:8	140:17	R, F	138:21 138:24 139:18 140:18	138:22 139:16 140:7 140:21	NR, IC	140:22	141:3	R, M, F, PK
143:15	143:23	R, F	142:10	143:15	NR, L			
144:11	144:14	R, SP	144:15	144:25	NR, L, LF			
149:5	149:8	R, 1002	149:20 149:25	149:23 150:14	NR			
149:10	149:19	R, 1002	149:20 149:25	149:23 150:14	NR			
150:20	151:15	R, Badgering, M	149:20 149:25	149:23 150:14	NR			
155:20	157:4	R, SP, PK, F, ID, Badgering	155:17	155:19				
157:5	157:8	R, SP, PK, F, ID, Badgering	155:17	155:19				
157:10	157:11	R, SP, PK, F, ID, Badgering	155:17	155:19				
160:21	161:2	R, SP, PK, F, V						
161:4	161:5							
161:11	161:22	R, F, SP, NT, LD, Badgering						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
161:25	162:7	R, F, SP, NT, LD, Badgering						
162:9	162:19	R, F, SP	164:4	164:25	IC, R, P			
165:19	166:1	R, F, PK, SP	167:13	167:24	R			
166:2	166:3	R, F, PK, SP	167:13	167:24	R			
166:5	166:24	R, F, PK, SP	167:13	167:24	R			
166:25	167:12	R, F, PK, SP	167:13	167:24	R			
168:3	168:11	R, F						
168:12	169:1	R, F						
169:15	169:21	R, F, ID, M, LD	170:11 170:25	170:12 171:12	R, Spec, PK, NR, IC, F			
169:23	170:9	R, F, ID, M, LD	170:11 170:25	170:12 171:12				
171:15	171:18	R, F	171:22 172:1	171:24 172:8	C, R, NR			
171:21	171:21	R, F	171:22 172:1	171:24 172:8	C, R, NR			
172:10	172:11	R, F, SP, M, NR						
172:14	172:16	R, F, SP, M, NR						
174:1	174:7	R, F, PK, SP, M	172:19	172:22	IC, NR	173:3	173:7	IC, R, M, F
174:8	174:10	R, F, PK, SP, M	172:19	172:22	IC, NR	173:3	173:7	IC, R, M, F
174:12	174:20	R, F, PK, SP, M	172:19	172:22	IC, NR	173:3	173:7	IC, R, M, F
175:7	176:5	R, F, PK, SP, 1002						
176:11	177:5	R, F, PK, SP, 1002						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
177:7	177:14	R, F, PK, SP, 1002						
178:6	178:12	R, F, PK, 1002						
178:13	178:19	R, F, PK, 1002						
178:24	179:4	R, F, PK, 1002						
181:6	181:12	R, F, 1002	181:13	181:25	NR, P, F, R			
182:17	183:7	R, F, SP, PK, M, LD	183:8	183:9				
196:18	196:23	R, F	197:20	197:25	IC, R, P	198:1	198:4	IC, R, M, F, PK
197:4	197:19	R, F	197:20	197:25	IC, R, P	198:1	198:4	IC, R, M, F, PK
198:15	199:2	R, F						
202:12	202:18	R, F						
205:24	206:9	R, F,	206:10	206:15	R, P, C			
206:17	207:2	R, F	206:10	206:15	R, P, C			
209:12	211:15	R, F, PK, SP, ID	211:19	212:18	R, C			
212:19	213:12	R, F, PK, SP	211:19	212:18	R, C			
213:24	214:8	R, F, PK, SP						
215:18	216:4	R, F, PK, SP, ID	216:6	216:21	R			
216:24	217:11	R, F, SP						
217:12	217:16	R, F, SP						
217:21	218:1	R, F, SP	218:2	218:7	C			
218:20	219:21	R, F, SP	218:8	218:19	C			
223:3	223:24	R, F, SP						
231:2	231:15	R, F, SP, PK						
231:18	232:1	R, F, SP, PK						
233:23	234:2	R, F, SP, PK	234:3	234:21	R, C			

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
235:2	235:23	R, F, SP, PK						
235:24	236:16	R, F, SP, PK						
242:3	242:14	R, F, SP, PK						
263:14	264:2	R, F, PK, NR						
264:16	265:2	R, F, PK						
265:7	265:9	R						
265:10	266:2	R						
266:3	266:9	R						
266:10	266:24	R						
271:8	271:12	R, F, SP, PK						
271:13	271:21	R, F, SP, PK						
271:22	272:1	R, F, SP, PK						
272:5	272:9	R, F, SP, PK						
274:17	274:18	R, F, SP, PK	273:25 274:4	274:2 274:13	IC, R, NR, P			
274:20	275:13	R, F, SP, PK	273:25 274:4	274:2 274:13	IC, R, NR, P			
278:2	278:8	R, F, SP, PK						
279:1	279:12	R, F, SP, PK						
280:4	280:8	R, F, SP, PK						
280:9	281:1	R, F, SP, PK						
281:2	283:1	R, F, SP, PK						
283:2	283:8	R, F, SP, PK						
286:17	287:23	R, F, SP, PK						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Jeff Taylor (October 26, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
290:22	291:4	R, F, SP, PK						
291:17	291:20	R						
292:9	292:25	R, F, SP, PK						
307:22	308:7	R	308:8	308:24	IC, NR, R, P, ML			
309:23	310:1	R, F, SP, PK	310:2	310:4	R			
310:5	310:6	R, F, SP, PK	310:2	310:4	R			
310:8	310:15	R, F, SP, PK	310:2	310:4	R			
312:15	313:1	R, F, SP, PK						
313:2	314:2	R, F, SP, PK						
314:3	314:7	R, F, SP, PK						
314:9	314:19	R, F, SP, PK						
314:21	315:4	R, F, SP, PK						
318:19	319:6	R, F, SP, PK						
326:22	327:4	R, F, SP, PK, ID, 1002	329:2 329:6	329:4 329:13	R, NR, IC	59:25	60:10	R, M, F, PK
327:5	329:1	R, F, SP, PK	329:2 329:6	329:4 329:13	R, NR, IC	59:25	60:10	R, M, F, PK
332:13	333:12	R, F, SP, PK	329:2 329:6	329:4 329:13	R, NR, IC	59:25	60:10	R, M, F, PK

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
7:14	7:18	IDe						
8:7	8:12	IDe						
8:13	8:15	IDe						
12:13	12:19	IDe	12:20 13:16	13:3 13:22	R, C			
14:15	14:19	IDe						
15:1	15:12	IDe						
19:5	19:21	IDe						
19:24	19:25	IDe	22:17 24:21 35:22	24:15 25:10 36:13	R, C			
20:1	20:2	IDe	22:17 24:21 35:22	24:15 25:10 35:13	R, C			
20:3	20:7	IDe	22:17 24:21 35:22	24:15 25:10 35:13	R, C			
20:8	20:16	IDe	22:17 24:21 35:22	24:15 25:10 35:13	R, C			
20:18	20:23	IDe	22:17 24:21 35:22	24:15 25:10 35:13	R, C			
25:11	26:8	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
26:23	27:2	IDe	27:19	28:8				
28:14	29:14	IDe						
32:2	32:11	IDe, R, C, P						
36:18	37:10	IDe						
37:16	37:18	IDe, F, V						
37:22	37:23	IDe						
38:3	38:18	IDe						
39:7	39:13	IDe, V						
39:16	39:24	IDe, V						
41:5	41:11	IDe						
41:14	41:25	IDe						
42:21	43:5	IDe						
43:8	43:13	IDe						
46:13	46:15	IDe, V, IO, 701						
46:19	46:23	IDe, V, IO, 701						
47:21	47:24	IDe, V, 701						
48:2	48:15	IDe, V, 701						
48:21	48:24	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC						
49:16	49:21	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC, 701						
50:1	50:1	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC						
50:4	50:10	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC						
50:14	50:16	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC						
50:19	50:21	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
50:22	50:24	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC						
51:2	51:4	IDe, V, F, IO, SP, LC						
52:25	53:2	IDe, V, F, IO, 701, SP, LC						
53:6	53:6	IDe, V, F, IO, 701, SP, LC						
54:10	54:17	IDe, R						
54:19	54:21	IDe						
54:25	55:1	IDe						
55:22	55:25	IDe						
56:3	56:5	IDe						
56:18	56:19	IDe, R, C, P						
56:23	57:3	IDe, R, C, P						
57:6	57:11	IDe						
57:14	57:16	IDe, R, C, P						
58:1	58:1	IDe, R, C, P						
58:7	58:9	IDe, R, C, P						
58:10	58:10	IDe, R, C, P						
58:14	58:16	IDe, R, C, P						
58:19	58:22	IDe, R, C, P						
58:24	58:24	IDe, R, C, P						
59:20	59:21	IDe, R, C, P						
59:24	59:24	IDe, R, C, P						
60:6	60:9	IDe, R, C, P						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
60:12	60:18	IDe, R, C, P						
60:22	61:1	IDe, R, C, P						
61:4	61:7	IDe, R, C, P						
61:9	61:10	IDe, R, C, P						
61:12	61:12	IDe, R, C, P						
63:15	64:1	IDe						
64:3	64:5	IDe						
64:15	65:13	IDe, IC	65:20	65:24				
73:19	74:3	IDe						
74:11	74:16	IDe						
74:19	74:24	IDe						
75:1	76:2	IDe						
76:8	76:10	IDe						
76:13	76:15	IDe						
76:16	76:18	IDe, F						
76:22	76:22	IDe, F						
79:8	79:20	IDe						
79:21	79:22	IDe						
81:4	81:16	IDe, H						
86:13	86:21	IDe, H						
86:25	87:6	IDe, H, SP, IO, F						
87:11	87:20	IDe, H, SP, IO, F						
87:23	87:24	IDe, H, SP, IO, F						
88:2	88:6	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
88:11	88:22	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						
89:3	89:5	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						
89:20	89:24	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						
90:1	90:2	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						
90:20	90:24	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						
91:2	91:8	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						
91:9	91:17	IDe, H, SP, IO, F, M						
97:11	97:18	IDe						
98:5	98:10	IDe						
98:18	99:3	IDe						
101:6	101:25	IDe						
102:1	102:15	IDe, H						
102:18	103:5	IDe, H, SP						
103:9	103:11	IDe, H, SP						
103:12	103:25	IDe, H, SP						
104:1	104:11	IDe, H, SP						
104:16	104:18	IDe, H, SP, M						
108:9	108:15	IDe, H						
114:4	114:11	IDe						
114:12	114:18	IDe, LC, F, 701						
114:22	115:1	IDe						
115:2	115:5	IDe, LC, F, 701						
115:8	115:14	IDe, LC, F, 701						
115:18	115:18	IDe, F, 701, V						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
120:24	121:5	IDe						
121:7	121:10	IDe, F, SP						
121:14	121:17	IDe, F, SP						
121:20	122:4	IDe, F, SP						
123:5	123:12	IDe						
123:13	123:20	IDe, F						
123:24	124:13	IDe						
126:13	127:4	IDe						
127:22	127:25	IDe						
128:3	128:5	IDe, NT						
130:14	131:4	IDe, H, SP, F						
131:8	131:11	IDe, H, SP, F	132:21 135:6 137:9 141:1 142:7	133:18 136:7 137:24 142:2 142:12	F, PK, Spec, 701, AT, P	134:24	135:1	IDe, ID, SP, NT
131:15	131:24	IDe						
142:15	142:24	IDe						
143:4	143:11	IDe, SP, V, IO, F	132:21 135:6 137:9 141:1 142:7	133:18 136:7 137:24 142:2 142:12	F, PK, Spec, 701, AT, P	134:24 135:5 136:14 136:20 140:6	135:1 135:5 136:16 136:21 140:25	IDe, ID, SP, NT IDe, SP IDe, SP, PK IDe, SP, PK IDe, SP, PK

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
143:14	143:14	IDe, SP, V, IO, F						
143:20	143:25	IDe, SP, V, IO, F						
144:3	144:5	IDe, SP, V, IO, F						
144:6	144:13	IDe, SP, V, IO, F						
144:16	144:19	IDe, SP, V, IO, F						
145:5	145:14	IDe						
145:18	145:23	IDe						
146:2	146:4	IDe						
147:14	147:17	IDe	132:21 135:6 137:9 141:1 142:7	133:18 136:7 137:24 142:2 142:12	F, PK, Spec, 701, AT	134:24	135:1	IDe, ID, SP, NT
150:17	150:18	IDe, LD						
150:22	151:2	IDe						
151:3	151:5	IDe, L, F, SP						
151:9	151:13	IDe, L, F, SP						
151:15	151:15	IDe, L, F, SP						
156:10	158:8	IDe						
159:5	159:9	IDe, H, SP, F						
159:13	159:19	IDe						
159:21	159:23	IDe						
160:15	160:17	IDe, H, SP, F, V						
160:20	161:17	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
168:12	168:19	IDe						
168:21	169:21	IDe						
171:20	172:12	IDe						
172:17	172:22	IDe, SP, F, V, LC, Arg						
173:1	173:7	IDe						
173:8	173:12	IDe, SP, F, V, IO, Arg						
173:17	173:22	IDe						
176:10	176:13	IDe, ID	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25 189:8	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4 190:14	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
177:23	178:2	IDe						
178:6	178:7	IDe, V, SP	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25 189:8	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4 190:14	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
178:13	178:18	IDe, V, SP, IO	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25 189:8	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4 190:14	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations**Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)**

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
178:22	178:22	IDe						
179:22	180:2	IDe, V, S, P, IO	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25 189:8	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4 190:14	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
180:6	180:6	IDe, V, S, P, IO	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25 189:8	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4 190:14	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
180:9	180:24	IDe, V, S, P, IO	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25 189:8	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4 190:14	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
181:4	181:12	IDe, V, SP, IO,	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25 189:8	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4 190:14	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
181:18	181:20	IDe, V, P, IO, M	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			189:8	190:14				
185:4	185:9	IDe, LD, F	176:14 178:23 181:22	177:19 179:21 183:6	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
185:10	185:25	IDe, LD, F	176:14 178:23 181:22	177:19 179:21 183:6	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
186:5	186:12	IDe, F, SP						
186:16	187:5	IDe, F, SP						
187:7	187:14	IDe, V, F, SP	176:14 178:23 181:22 187:25	177:19 179:21 183:6 188:4	R, P, F, PK, Spec, H, AT	183:9	183:13	IDe, Cmpd, R, M, F, V, PK, IO
191:7	191:17	IDe						
191:19	192:23	IDe						
192:24	193:3	IDe, F, SP						
193:7	194:5	IDe, F, SP						
194:17	194:19	IDe, SP, F						
194:23	195:1	IDe, SP, F						
196:25	197:5	IDe, ID	192:14	192:22				
197:20	197:25	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)

Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
198:8	200:20	IDe						
202:19	202:23	IDe, SP, F, IO						
203:3	203:20	IDe						
204:3	204:10	IDe, SP, F	205:1	205:23	Spec	205:4 206:4 206:9	206:2 206:2 206:18	IDe, C IDe, SP, F, M (for 205:24-206:2) IDe, NT, SP, F, M IDe, SP, F, M
208:2	208:6	IDe						
209:7	209:10	IDe, SP, F						
209:14	210:8	IDe, SP, F						
214:10	214:24	IDe						
215:9	215:11	IDe, SP, V, Cmpd						
215:15	216:1	IDe, SP, V, Cmpd						
216:25	217:7	IDe						
217:10	217:12	IDe, NT						
219:25	220:23	IDe						
221:1	221:7	IDe						
221:8	221:16	IDe						
221:23	222:11	IDe						
222:14	222:16	IDe						
222:20	223:11	IDe						
224:25	225:1	IDe, SP, V						
225:5	225:12	IDe, SP, V						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
228:13	230:3	IDe	230:4	231:12	P, F, PK, Spec, 701, LC, H, AT			
244:17	245:1	IDe	230:14	231:12	R, C, P, F, PK, Spec, 701, LC, H, ML, AT	243:20 244:4	243:24 244:14	IDe, SP, F, M
			232:13	232:24				
			233:2	233:15				
			233:19	234:1				
			234:5	241:4				
			241:23	243:19				IDe, SP, F, M
245:2	245:16	IDe						
245:20	246:2	IDe						
247:3	247:5	IDe, LC, F, V						
247:12	247:21	IDe, LC, F, V						
247:23	247:23	IDe, LC, F, V						
248:1	248:3	IDe, F, SP						
248:8	249:2	IDe, F, SP						
249:3	249:7	IDe						
249:10	249:23	IDe						
254:2	254:18	IDe	256:20	256:24	F, PK, Spec, 701, LC, H, ML	257:14 257:24 258:25 259:11	257:21 258:3 259:4 259:16	IDe, V
			257:9	257:13				IDe, V, SP, Cmpd
			258:4	258:9				IDe, V, SP, Cmpd
			258:18	258:23				IDe, V, SP, Cmpd

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						267:11 268:1	267:23 268:7	IDe, R, F, PK, SP, BSE IDe, R, F, BSE
254:19	255:2	IDe, H, F, V, P						
259:17	260:10	IDe						
260:12	260:18	IDe, F						
260:22	261:9	IDe, F						
263:2	263:23	IDe						
264:3	264:13	IDe						
270:6	270:12	IDe						
270:16	270:21	IDe						
271:15	271:24	IDe	230:14 232:13 233:2 233:19 234:5 241:23	231:12 232:24 233:15 234:1 241:4 243:19	R, C, P, F, PK, Spec, 701, LC, H, ML, AT	243:20 244:4	243:24 244:14	IDe, SP, F, M IDe, SP, F, M
273:9	273:17	IDe						
273:23	274:19	IDe						
274:23	275:13	IDe						
275:20	275:24	IDe						
275:25	276:3	IDe						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
276:4	276:6	IDe						
276:7	276:18	IDe, SP, F, L						
276:24	277:9	IDe, SP, F, L						
278:18	279:4	IDe						
279:17	281:2	IDe						
281:10	281:14	IDe						
282:10	282:12	IDe, M, F, SP						
282:17	282:19	IDe, M, F, SP						
282:24	283:1	IDe						
283:14	283:14	IDe						
284:2	284:8	IDe	328:24	329:7	R, P, F, PK, Spec, 701, LC, ML	331:24 332:7	332:1 332:13	IDe, V, SP, Cmpd, BSE IDe, V, SP, Cmpd, BSE
284:24	285:1	IDe						
285:5	285:8	IDe						
286:12	286:14	IDe						
286:15	286:17	IDe						
289:14	289:25	IDe						
290:15	291:11	IDe						
291:21	292:2	IDe						
292:5	292:12	IDe	293:1	293:16	PK, Spec	292:19 293:17	292:25 293:20	IDe IDe, SP

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Affirmative Designations

Edmund Webecke (October 17, 2017)								
Plaintiff's Designations		Defendants' Objections	Defendants' Counter-Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Designations	Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						293:24	294:2	IDE, SP
294:3	294:11	IDE						
294:15	295:2	IDE						
295:3	295:8	IDE						
300:5	300:24	IDE						
300:25	302:17	IDE						
308:20	309:14	IDE, SP						
309:19	311:11	IDE, SP						
311:15	312:12	IDE						
315:20	316:13	IDE						
317:7	317:19	IDE						
317:25	318:4	IDE						
318:21	320:18	IDE						
320:19	321:24	IDE						
323:23	325:25	IDE						
326:4	326:5	IDE						

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

ABBREV.	OBJECTION	RULE / EXPLANATION
A	Authentication or Identification (FRE 901)	The requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.
Arg	Argumentative	
AT	Attorney Objections Not Removed	
BSE	Beyond Scope of Direct / Cross / Or Redirect Examination	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope of the direct, cross, or redirect examination.
BSS	Beyond Scope of Subpoena	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope of the subpoena
BST	Beyond Scope of Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Topic	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope for which the witness was designated to testify pursuant Rule 30(b)(6).
C	Cumulative, Duplicative, Wasteful or Undue Delay (FRE 403)	Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of duplicative and/or cumulative evidence.
Char	Improper Character Evidence (FRE 404)	
Cmpd	Compound	
D	Not Produced During Discovery	
F	Lack of Foundation (FRE 602)	Objectionable because a witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter.
H	Hearsay Rule (FRE 802)	Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority or by Act of Congress.
I	Incomplete Document (FRE 106)	Objectionable because document is incomplete and the introduction of the remaining portions or related documents ought, in fairness, to be considered contemporaneously with it.
ID	Improper/Incomplete Designation (FRCP 32(a)(6))	Objectionable because additional parts of the testimony in fairness should be considered with the part of the testimony designated.
IC	Improper/Incomplete Counter Designation (FRCP 32(a)(6))	Objectionable because additional parts of the testimony in fairness should be considered with the part of the testimony designated.
IO	Improper Lay or Expert Opinion (FRE 701-703)	Objectionable because the testimony is outside the scope of proper lay or expert testimony.
IP	Improper Use of Deposition Testimony (FRCP 32)	Objectionable because the designation is inconsistent with the proper use of deposition testimony pursuant to FRCP 32.
IDe	Improper Designation of Witness who will be Called Live	Objectionable because the witness who gave the designated testimony will be called to testify at trial.
LC	Legal Conclusion (FRE 403)	Objectionable because witness testimony constituting a legal conclusion creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

		the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
LD	Leading (FRE 611)	Objectionable because leading questions should not be used on direct examination except as necessary to develop the witness's testimony.
M	Mischaracterizes Prior Testimony (FRE 401-403, 611)	Objectionable because the designation includes mischaracterization of prior testimony, as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
MD	Mischaracterizes Underlying Document	Objectionable because the designation includes mischaracterization of an underlying document, as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
NE	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence	Objectionable because the question assumes facts not in evidence.
NR	Nonresponsive	Objectionable because the designated testimony is not responsive to the question.
NT	Not Testimony	Objectionable because the designated material is not testimonial.
OS	Offer of Settlement (FRE 408)	Evidence of an offer of consideration to compromise or attempt to compromise a claim, or conduct or a statement made during compromise negotiations about the claim, is not admissible.
P	Prejudicial, Confusing, Vague and/or Misleading (FRE 403)	Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.
PK	Lack of Personal Knowledge (FRE 602)	Objectionable because lack of personal knowledge makes the witness incompetent to testify about particular facts.
PR	Privilege (FRE 501-502)	The evidence is subject to a claim of attorney-client privilege or other privilege.
R	Relevance (FRE 401, 402)	All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence that is not relevant is not admissible.
SP	Calls for Speculation	Objectionable because the designation includes a question calling for speculation and/or speculation as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
S	Summaries (FRE 1006)	The party relying on the summary must establish its accuracy to the court's satisfaction. <i>See</i> Graham, Handbook of Federal Evidence § 1006.1 (5th ed. 2001). <i>United States v. Pelullo</i> , 964 F.2d 193, 204 (3d Cir. 1992) ("It is well established that summary evidence is admissible under Rule 1006 only if the underlying materials upon which the summary is based are admissible.").
V	Vague, Ambiguous or Overbroad (FRE 611)	
105	Limited Admissibility (FRE 105)	When evidence that is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.
701	Improper Lay Opinion	If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

	Testimony (FRE 701)	opinion is limited as provided by this rule.
1002	Best Evidence (FRE 1002)	An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless the rules or a federal statute provide otherwise.
PD	Post Dated Filing Date (FRE 105)	If post-dated evidence is admitted as to one purpose but not admissible as for another purpose (e.g., for obviousness analysis), the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.
Badgering	Badgering the Witness	Inappropriate badgering of the witness.
X		Exhibit has not been provided, the copy provided is illegible, and/or the entry includes multiple documents.
Y	Wrong Document Identified or Incorrect Description of Document	
MIL	Motion in Limine	Subject to motion in limine.

Plaintiff's Objections Key

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
A	<p>Authentication or Identification (FRE 901)</p> <p>The requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.</p>
Arg	Argumentative
AT	Attorney Objections Not Removed
BS	Beyond the Scope of Direct / Cross / Redirect Examination
30(b)(6)	Beyond the Scope of the Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Topic
C	<p>Cumulative, Duplicative, Wasteful or Undue Delay (FRE 403)</p> <p>Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of duplicative and/or cumulative evidence.</p>
Char	Improper Character Evidence (FRE 404)
Cmpd	Compound
Dem Only	Demonstrative / Should Not Be Admitted Into Evidence
D	Not Produced During Discovery
F	<p>Lack of Foundation (FRE 602)</p> <p>Objectionable because a witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter.</p>
H	<p>Hearsay Rule (FRE 802)</p> <p>Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority or by Act of Congress.</p>

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
I	Incomplete Document (FRE 106) Objectionable because document is incomplete and the introduction of the remaining portions or related documents ought, in fairness, to be considered contemporaneously with it.
IC	Improper Designation / Counter Designation (FRE 106: FRCP 32(a)(6))
ID	Incomplete Document (FRE 106)
In	Incomplete Testimony (FRE 106; FRCP 32(a)(6))
L	Lack of Personal Knowledge or Competency (FRE 602)
LA	Limited Admissibility (Admissible for Some Purposes but Not Others) (FRE 105)
LC	Legal Conclusion
LD	Leading (FRE 611)
LF	Lack of Foundation (FRE 103, 104 and/or 105)
M	Misleading/Mischaracterizes Prior Testimony (FRE 401-403, 611)
MD	Mischaracterizes Underlying. Document (FRE 401-403, 611)
ML	Subject to Motion In Limine
NE	Assumes Facts Not In Evidence
NR	Nonresponsive
NT	Not Testimony
O	Improper Lay or Expert Opinion (FRE 701-703)
OC	Offer to Compromise, Settlement (FRE 408)

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
P	<p>Prejudicial, Confusing, Vague and/or Misleading (FRE 403)</p> <p>Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.</p>
PD	<p>Post Dated Filing Date (FRE 105)</p> <p>If post-dated evidence is admitted as to one purpose but not admissible as for another purpose (e.g., for obviousness analysis), the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.</p>
PK	<p>Lack of Personal Knowledge (FRE 602)</p> <p>Objectionable because lack of personal knowledge makes the witness incompetent to testify about particular facts.</p>
R	<p>Relevance (FRE 401, 402)</p> <p>All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible.</p>
Spec	<p>Calls for Speculation (FRE 602)</p>
S	<p>Summaries (FRE 1006)</p> <p>The party relying on the summary must establish its accuracy to the court's satisfaction.</p> <p><i>See Graham, Handbook of Federal Evidence § 1006.1 (5th ed. 2001). United States v. Pelullo, 964 F.2d 193, 204 (3d Cir. 1992) ("It is well established that summary evidence is admissible under Rule 1006 only if the underlying materials upon which the summary is based are admissible.").</i></p>
U	<p>Untimely / Never Produced (FRCP 26, 37)</p>
V	<p>Vague / Ambiguous/Overbroad (FRE 611)</p>
W	<p>Privileged / Work Product (FRE 501/502)</p>
X	<p>Exhibit has not been provided, the copy provided is illegible, and/or the entry includes multiple documents.</p>

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
Y	Wrong Document Identified or Incorrectly Described
105	<p>Limited Admissibility (FRE 105)</p> <p>When evidence which is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.</p>
701	<p>Improper Lay Opinion Testimony (FRE 701)</p> <p>If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an opinion is limited as provided by this rule.</p>
1002	<p>Best Evidence (FRE 1002, 1003, 1004)</p> <p>An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless these rules or a federal statute provides otherwise.</p>

PART V. DEFENDANTS' WITNESSES AND SUMMARY OF THEIR TESTIMONY AND DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS

Defendants intend to call the following witnesses and anticipate they will testify as follows:

A. Will Call for Live Testimony

Witness	Summary of Testimony
Jeffery Lewis c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Lewis is the Senior Vice President of Engineering at Geomni Inc. He has worked for Defendants in various capacities and positions since 1997. He may testify about his professional background; the operation, functionality, and use of the Accused Products and related systems; research, design, and development of the Accused Products and related systems; the architecture of the Accused Products and related systems; the origin, creation, engineering, development, compilation, storage, location, execution, and use of Defendants' software and source code; documentation concerning the Accused Products and related systems; the Xactimate platform, embedded modules and features thereof, and third-party integrations therewith; historic capabilities, functions, and features of Xactimate; the relationship and interactions between and among Defendants, EagleView, Pictometry, and EagleView Technology Corporation; facts and circumstances underlying and supporting Defendants' positions, contentions, and arguments that the Defendants do not infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent. He may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, and may testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.

Witness	Summary of Testimony
<p>Edmund Webecke</p> <p>c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Webecke is the President of Verisk 3E. Mr. Webecke may testify regarding his professional background; sales and pricing with regard to the products that are the subject of this case; the development of Defendants' products; the Accused Products in this case; Defendants' customers and customer satisfaction; the operations of and strategies relating to Defendants' businesses; the development and execution of marketing, advertising, and promotion strategies by Defendants; the relationship and interactions between and among Defendants, EagleView, Pictometry, and EagleView Technology Corporation; the dates and circumstances related to when and how Defendants first learned of the Asserted Patents; the dates and circumstances related to when and how Defendants first learned of EagleView; the products, including those of Defendants, that compete with EagleView and/or Pictometry products; presentations, meetings, and discussions regarding EagleView, Pictometry, and/or EagleView Technology Corporation, their products, and/or the Asserted Patents; the corporate structure of the Defendants; the practice and procedures of Defendants for assessing patent infringement risks; business relationships concerning the Accused Products; EagleView's representations of infringement and non-infringement, and Defendants' actions relating to those representations; and Verisk's and/or Xactware's contemplated acquisition of or merger with EagleView, Pictometry, and/or EagleView Technology Corporation. Mr. Webecke may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, and may testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>

B. May Call for Live Testimony or by Deposition

Witness	Summary of Testimony
<p>Michael Fulton</p> <p>c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Fulton is the President of Xactware Solutions. He began his career as a self-employed general contractor before joining Xactware in 1992. Mr. Fulton may testify regarding his professional background; sales and pricing with regard to the products that are the subject of this case; the development of Defendants' products; the Accused Products in this case; Defendants' customers and customer satisfaction; the operations of and strategies relating to Defendants' businesses; the development and execution of marketing, advertising, and promotion strategies by Defendants; the markets in which the Accused Products compete; the use and benefits of the Xactimate platform; the relationship and interactions between and among Defendants, EagleView, Pictometry, and EagleView Technology Corporation; the products, including those of Defendants, that compete with EagleView and/or Pictometry products; presentations, meetings, and discussions regarding EagleView, Pictometry, and/or EagleView Technology Corporation, their products, and/or the Asserted Patents; and the corporate structure of the Defendants. Mr. Fulton may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, and may testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>James Loveland (third party)</p> <p>1091 Hawks Rest Drive,</p>	<p>Mr. Loveland is the former President and CEO of Xactware. He may testify about his professional background; EagleView's approach to Xactware regarding a business partnership;</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
Mapleton, Utah 84664 c/o Mark Morris Snell & Wilmer, LLP 15 West South Temple Suite 1200 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101	Xactware's historic capabilities, including regarding the use of aerial imagery and roof modeling; development and operation of Xactimate, Aerial Sketch, and other Xactware products; the success of Xactimate; and background information on Xactware. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Peter Magnus Olson c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Olson is the Senior Vice President of Data & Production at Geomni, and was formerly the Assistant Vice President of Geospatial Data Services and the Director of Imagery Services at Xactware. He may testify regarding his professional background, education, and qualifications, and about various patents, including the Asserted Patents. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Jarron Merrill c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Merrill is the Assistant Vice President of Finance at Xactware. He may testify regarding his professional background; revenue and profit from the sale of the Accused Products; and related financial and accounting systems, practices, and documents. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Jeffrey Taylor c/o McCarter & English LLP Four Gateway Center 100 Mulberry Street Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Taylor is the President of Geomni Inc. and a former Vice President of the Property InSight Group at Xactware. He may testify regarding his professional background; the operation, functionality, and use of the Accused Products and related systems; research, design, and development of the Accused Products and related systems; the Xactimate platform; historic capabilities, functions, and features of Xactimate; historical market presence of Geomni and Xactware; market reaction,

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	<p>including the reactions of end-users, to products developed, sold, and resold by Geomni and/or Xactware; Defendants' customers and customer satisfaction; the relationship and interactions between and among Defendants, EagleView, Pictometry, and EagleView Technology Corporation; presentations, meetings, and discussions regarding EagleView, Pictometry, and/or EagleView Technology Corporation, their products, and/or the Asserted Patents; the facts and circumstances underlying and supporting Defendants' positions, contentions, and arguments that Defendants do not infringe any Asserted Claim of any Asserted Patent. Mr. Taylor may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, and may testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Chris Pershing (EagleView)</p> <p>c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Pershing co-founded EagleView, served as its Chief Technology Officer until 2016, and is a named inventor of the Asserted Patents. He may testify regarding his professional background; EagleView's software and the development thereof; his knowledge of the prior art; the efforts of and benefits to EagleView with respect to integration on the Xactimate platform; his purported contributions to the Asserted Patents; proceedings relevant to the Asserted Patents before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; public use, disclosure, or sale of the subject matter of the Asserted Patents; conception and reduction to practice of the supposed inventions of the Asserted Patents; contributions of third parties to the supposed inventions of the Asserted Patents; how Twister and Render House do not practice or embody the Asserted Patents; the level of ordinary skill</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	<p>in the art relevant to the Asserted Patents; EagleView's knowledge, understanding, and use of Defendants' products; EagleView's investigation, study, and review of Defendants' products; EagleView's first awareness of Defendants' products; communications regarding any of the Accused Products, alone or in combination with EagleView's software and products; the factual basis for EagleView's allegations of infringement; facts and circumstances concerning when EagleView first formed a belief of the alleged infringement of any Asserted Claim by Defendants; the factual basis for EagleView's allegation of willful infringement; EagleView's communications with Defendants regarding the Asserted Patents; EagleView's patent marking methods; EagleView's competitors; non-infringing alternatives to products and methods claimed in the Asserted Patents; the extent of EagleView's use of Xactimate; the absence of secondary considerations of non-obviousness; the invalidity of each Asserted Claim; the factual basis for the supposed priority date of each Asserted Patent; and the disclosure of the subject matter of the Asserted Patents prior to the issuance of each. Mr. Pershing may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, and may testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>David Carlson (third party)</p> <p>4415 Witter Gulch Road, Evergreen, Colorado 80439</p> <p>c/o Ruttenberg IP Law</p>	<p>Mr. Carlson is named as an inventor on the '436 Patent. He may testify regarding his professional background; his knowledge of the prior art; his contribution to the purported invention(s) of the Asserted Patents; his relationship with Chris Pershing; Chris Pershing's contribution to the purported</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
1801 Century Park East, Suite 1920 Los Angeles, CA 90067	invention(s) of the Asserted Patents; his understanding of the Asserted Patents; his current and past relationship with EagleView and the facts and circumstances surrounding his departure from EagleView; the roofing and contracting industries; the parties to this case; and demand for EagleView products. Mr. Carlson may also testify regarding the subject matter about which he testified at his depositions.
Todd Long (EagleView) c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102	Mr. Long is Senior Manager of Report Delivery at EagleView. He may testify regarding his professional background; the operation of Render House and Twister; the division of labor at EagleView with respect to the generation of roof models and the creation of roof reports; competitors of EagleView; techniques for measuring roofs; and the content of EagleView's roof reports. Mr. Long may also testify regarding the subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Chris Ciarcia (EagleView) c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102	Dr. Ciarcia is a physicist at EagleView. He may testify regarding his professional and educational background; the feasibility of reverse engineering EagleView's software; sourcing of aerial imagery and information or data regarding aerial imagery; EagleView's recent development efforts regarding primitives; and Pictometry's historic capabilities to use aerial images to measure and model buildings. Dr. Ciarcia may also testify regarding the subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
Rishi Daga (EagleView) c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza	Mr. Daga joined EagleView in 2008 and is currently its CEO. He may testify regarding his professional background; EagleView's business, business practices and methods, including the filing of lawsuits; the identity of EagleView's

Witness	Summary of Testimony
1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102	competitors; EagleView's internal discussions about competitors and business partners, including Defendants; EagleView's sales practices; EagleView's communications to customers and potential customers of Defendants; EagleView's use of Xactimate to deliver roof reports; instances of EagleView threatening litigation or sending cease and desist letters regarding alleged infringement of intellectual property; EagleView's past and present sources of aerial imagery; EagleView's corporate structure and ownership; communications among EagleView, Pictometry, and EagleView Technology Corporation; EagleView's ownership of the Asserted Patents; Verisk's intended acquisition of EagleView and EagleView Technology Corporation; the creation of EagleView Technology Corporation; the factual basis for EagleView's claim for damages; pricing of EagleView's roof reports; computation of profits and losses from sales of EagleView's roof reports; EagleView's knowledge and understanding of other suppliers of rooftop aerial measurement products, past and present; non-infringing alternatives for the supposed inventions of the Asserted Patents; financial data relating to EagleView's products; EagleView's competitors and market share; valuation of EagleView's patents; licenses or other agreements concerning EagleView's patents; and the absence of secondary considerations of non-obvious. Mr. Daga may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, and may testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.

Witness	Summary of Testimony
<p>Chris Barrow (EagleView)</p> <p>c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Barrow is the former Chief Executive Officer of EagleView. He may testify regarding his professional background; EagleView's business, structure, and history, including its relationship with Defendants; the identity of EagleView's competitors; EagleView's history asserting unspecified threats of infringement against its competitors, and of filing infringement lawsuits against its competitors; EagleView's marketing practices; EagleView's roof model generation software; the value to EagleView of its business relationship with Defendants; EagleView's representations and warranties concerning intellectual property infringement to Verisk and to Vista Equity; the timing and circumstances of the filing of the present lawsuit against Defendants; and the unpatentability of the Asserted Patents. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Matt Quilter (EagleView)</p> <p>c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Quilter is the Chief Financial Officer of EagleView. He may testify regarding his professional background; EagleView's corporate structure, ownership, and relationships with its related entities; EagleView's merger and relationship with Pictometry; EagleView's finance and accounting systems, practices, reporting, statements, and other documentation; EagleView's finances, revenues, revenue sources, business, competition, production processes, products, sales, pricing, costs, assets, and valuations; use of Xactware's platform; and EagleView's relationship with Defendants. He may also testify regarding the subject matter of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics on which he was designated to testify, and may testify regarding</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
	other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.
<p>John Keane (EagleView)</p> <p>c/o WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP One Riverfront Plaza 1037 Raymond Blvd., Suite 600 Newark, New Jersey 07102</p>	<p>Mr. Keane is employed in the area of research and development for EagleView. He may testify regarding his professional background; his interactions with Chris Pershing and David P. Carlson; his contributions to patent inventorship on behalf of EagleView; his knowledge of EagleView's patents; his knowledge of and participation in developing roof measurement software for EagleView; the functionality of EagleView's software programs; his knowledge and understanding of EagleView's roof reports; his understanding of photogrammetry; methods for measuring roofs and generating roof reports; EagleView's business practices; his dealings with Xactware representatives; the identity of, and competition by, EagleView's competitors; EagleView's relationship with Defendants; his knowledge of the Accused Products; and the unpatentability of the Asserted Patents. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Adrian Alonso (Vista Equity)</p> <p>*c/o Smith Robertson, LLP 221 West 6th Street, Suite 1100, Austin, TX 78701</p>	<p>Mr. Alonso is a Senior Vice President at Vista Equity Partners. He may testify regarding his professional background; Vista Equity Partners' decision to acquire EagleView; and the representations EagleView made to Verisk and to Vista Equity regarding intellectual property infringement. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
<p>Michael Allen (USAA)</p> <p>c/o Ford Murray 10001 Reunion Place, Suite 640 San Antonio, TX 78216</p>	<p>Mr. Allen is a claims service manager at USAA. He may testify regarding his professional background; USAA's use of Xactware products, use of Eagleview products, and product selection; the insurer market; and roof estimate alternatives including manual estimation. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Matthew Levin (MetLife)</p> <p>c/o Robinson & Cole LLP One Financial Plaza Suite 1430 Providence, RI 02903</p>	<p>Mr. Levin is a claim technical administrator at Metropolitan Property & Casualty Insurance Co (MetLife). He may testify regarding his professional background and MetLife's purchase and use of aerial roof measurement tools. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Jason Pawlik (The Hartford)</p> <p>c/o The Hartford Law Department One Hartford Plaza H0-1-10 Hartford, CT 06155</p>	<p>Mr. Pawlik is a Director of Claims Strategy at The Hartford. He may testify about his professional background. He may also testify about The Hartford's decision-making process in purchasing products for automobile and property claims assessments, and unpatented features of such products, such as price, format, and related customer service that factor into this decision. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his deposition.</p>
<p>Lynn Berard (by declaration)</p> <p>Last known contact information:</p> <p>Carnegie Mellon University Libraries, Sorrels Engineering & Science Library, 5000 Forbes Ave.,</p>	<p>As of August 24, 2016, Lynn Berard was a Principal Librarian at the Carnegie Mellon University Libraries. Ms. Berard may testify, through declaration, regarding the content of the "Declaration of Lynn Berard" executed on August 24, 2016, including her professional background, the practices and procedures of the Carnegie Mellon University Libraries, and circumstances and background information relating to the public accessibility and public</p>

Witness	Summary of Testimony
Pittsburgh, PA 15212	availability of Hsieh, Y., "Design and Evaluation of a Semi-Automated Site Modeling System," Carnegie Mellon (November 1995).
Christopher Thornberry c/o Lewis & Kappes One American Square, Suite 2500 Indianapolis, IN 46282-0003	Mr. Thornberry is a principal of Thornberry Consulting. He may testify regarding his professional background; the creation and operation of the GeoEstimator product; that the GeoEstimator product is a non-infringing alternative to the Asserted Patents; his employment with Pictometry; his separation from employment with Pictometry; his communications with EagleView and David P. Carlson; and his understanding and knowledge of Aerowest and products of this company. He may also testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his October 9, 2012 deposition.
Dale Thornberry c/o Lewis & Kappes One American Square, Suite 2500 Indianapolis, IN 46282-0003	Mr. Thornberry is a principal of Thornberry Consulting. He may testify regarding his professional background; the creation and operation of the GeoEstimator product; that the GeoEstimator product is a non-infringing alternative to the Asserted Patents; the identity of other competitors in the market for roof reports; his employment with Pictometry; his separation from employment with Pictometry; his communications with EagleView and David P. Carlson; EagleView's patent applications and issued patents; and his understanding and knowledge of Aerowest and products of this company. He also may testify regarding other subject matter about which he testified at his October 9, 2012 deposition.

In addition, Defendants may call any witness by deposition or live testimony identified by Plaintiff in its witness lists.

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
4:22	4:24	A, H						
6:8	6:10	A, H, In	6:5	7:1				
7:24	8:5	A, H						
11:9	11:13	A, F, H, PK, In	10:21	11:3	V, SP, IC	11:14	11:20	F, V, Spec
			11:17	11:23	IC	11:14	11:16	F, V, Spec
14:16	14:18	A, H, In	14:13	15:17	ID, Cmpd, SP, PK, V, F	41:6 42:19	41:24 43:14	F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P
			17:1	17:3	ID, SP, BST	41:6 42:19	41:24 44:5	F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P
17:20	19:12	A, H, P	19:21	19:24	IC, V, M, SP	20:17 20:24 21:19	20:19 21:3 21:22	F, Spec F, Spec, Arg, V F, Spec, Arg, V
19:16	19:18	A, H	19:21	19:24	IC, V, M, SP	20:17 20:24 21:19	20:19 21:3 21:22	F, Spec F, Spec, Arg, V F, Spec, Arg, V
21:19	21:24	A, F, H, Spec, C	19:21	19:24	IC, V, M, SP	20:17 20:24	20:19 21:3	F, Spec F, Spec, Arg, V
22:11	22:15	A, F, H	19:21	19:24	IC, V, M, SP	20:17 20:24 21:19	20:19 21:3 21:22	F, Spec F, Spec, Arg, V F, Spec, Arg, V
			25:4	25:24	IC, M, V, PK, SP	26:16 41:6 42:19	26:21 41:24 44:5	F, Spec, V F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
23:21	24:5	A, F, H	24:9	25:2	IC, PK, SP, V, F, NE	26:16 41:6 42:19	26:21 41:24 44:5	F, Spec, V F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P
			25:4	25:24	IC, M, V, PK, SP	26:16 41:6 42:19	26:21 41:24 44:5	F, Spec, V F, Spec, V, H, Cmpd, Char F, Spec, H, Char, P
41:6	41:24	A, F, H, P	40:20	40:23	IC, LD, F, V, SP, PK	40:7 40:13 40:18	40:11 40:16 40:19	F, Spec, V F, Spec, H F, Spec, V, Arg
			42:4	42:13	IC	42:19	44:5	F, Spec, H, Char, P
42:19	43:14	A, F, H	44:11	44:14				
43:23	44:5	A, F, H, C	44:11	44:14				
44:11	44:14	A, F, H						
53:25	54:2	A, F, H, PK	53:10	53:12	IC, LD, V, NE	52:17 53:1	52:18 53:9	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
54:13	54:17	A, F, H, PK	57:16	57:23	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, SP	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			58:4	58:9	IC, D, A, SP, PK, V, LD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			58:14	58:16	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			58:20	59:9	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			59:12	59:17	IC, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, PK	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			59:19	59:23	IC, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, PK, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			60:1	60:4	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V,	57:6	57:10	F, V, Spec

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
					LD, MD	57:24	58:2	F, V, Spec
			60:8	60:9	IC, PK, A, SP, V, LD, D, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			60:12	61:7	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			61:11	61:20	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, At	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			61:23	61:25	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			62:3	62:6	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, Cmpd	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			62:9	62:20	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, Cmpd	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			63:7	63:10	PK, V, LD, M	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
54:19	55:12	A, F, H, PK, P, AT: 54:23	57:16	57:23	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			58:4	58:9	IC, D, A, SP, PK, V, LD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			58:14	58:16	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			58:20	59:9	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			59:12	59:17	IC, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, PK, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			59:19	59:23	IC, D, A, SP, V, LD, H, PK, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			60:1	60:4	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec

Michael Allen (March 29, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			60:8	60:9	IC, PK, A, SP, V, LD, D, MD, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			60:12	61:7	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			61:11	61:20	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, 1002, AT	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			61:23	61:25	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			62:3	62:6	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, Cmpd, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			62:9	62:20	IC, PK, D, A, SP, V, LD, MD, Cmpd, H, 1002	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
			63:7	63:10	PK, V, LD, M	57:6 57:24	57:10 58:2	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Adrian R. Alonso (January 30, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
10:20	10:24	Personal (Address), R, P, ML						
11:14	11:21	R, P, ML						
16:20	17:5	R, P, ML						
17:10	17:14	R, P, ML						
21:5	21:11	R, P, ML						
22:19	23:9	R, P, ML	23:10	23:18	R			
32:25	33:16	R, P, ML						
34:14	36:20	R, P, ML, F, Spec, H	38:6	38:18	R, PK, NR			
			38:19	39:7	R, PK, NR			
41:1	42:15	R, P, ML, F, Spec, H	40:1	40:6				
			40:12	40:25	R, PK,C			
46:20	46:24	R, P, ML, 30(b)(6), F						
47:2	47:3	R, P, ML, 30(b)(6),						

Adrian R. Alonso (January 30, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		F						
47:5	47:14	R, P, ML, 30(b)(6), F						
47:16	50:7	R, P, ML, F:46:16-17-30(b)(6)						
59:24	60:15	R, P, ML	60:16	61:2	R, PK			
			61:25	62:25	R, PK, NR			
61:3	61:24	R, P, ML	61:25	62:25	R, PK, NR			
			60:16	61:2	R, PK			
63:13	63:20	R, P, ML						
64:21	68:11	R, P, ML						
83:11	84:13	R, P, ML	84:14	85:11	R, NR, C			
			88:10	90:19	R, C, H, P, LC, PK			
87:15	87:24	R, P, ML	88:10	90:19	R, C, H, P, LC, PK			
88:1	88:8	R, P, ML	88:10	89:15	R, C, H, P, LC, PK			
109:13	110:2	R, P, ML, F, H	115:9	116:8	PK, H			
113:17	115:8	R, P, ML, F, H	115:9	116:8	PK, H			
116:9	116:22	R, P, ML, F, H						

Adrian R. Alonso (January 30, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
117:7	117:17	R, P, ML, IN	117:18	117:23				
118:17	119:6	R, P, ML						
119:14	119:23	R, P, ML, Spec, C, H, F, PK	120:8	120:17	F			
121:1	121:15	R, P, ML, Spec, PK, C, H, F	123:23	124:6				
123:4	123:22	Spec, R, P, PK, C, H, F, ML	123:23	124:6				
127:20	129:23	Spec, R, P, PK, C, H, F, ML	132:20	134:14	F			
132:12	132:19	Spec, R, P, PK, C, H, F, ML	132:20	134:14	LC, IO, 701			
136:19	138:12	R, P, ML, Arg., C						
138:13	138:25	R, P, ML, F						
145:1	145:13	R, P, ML						
145:22	145:25	Spec, R, P, PK, H, L, ML						
155:17	156:6	Spec, R, P, PK, ML	156:19	157:8	PK, R			
156:10	156:18	Spec, R, P, PK, H, F, ML	156:19	157:8	PK, R			

Adrian R. Alonso (January 30, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
157:9	158:16	Spec, R, P, PK, H, F, ML	156:19	157:8	PK, R			
158:25	159:16	Spec, R, P, PK, H, F, ML	156:19	157:8	PK, R			
159:18	160:14	Spec, R, P, PK, H, F, ML	156:19	157:8	PK, R			
160:16	161:2	Spec, R, P, PK, H, F, ML	161:3	161:6	PK	161:12 161:15	161:13 161:15	NR, M, C, R
			161:8	161:10		161:12 161:15	161:13 161:15	NR, M, C, R
			161:17	162:12		162:13	162:17	H, R, C,
162:22	163:12	Spec, R, P, PK, H, F, ML						
166:21	167:12	Spec, R, P, PK, ML						
167:14	167:14	Spec, R, P, PK, ML						
173:17	174:5	Spec, R, P, PK, F, ML						
174:8	174:11	Spec, R, P, PK, F, ML	174:13	175:1	PK, NT			
175:2	175:6	Spec, R, P, PK, F, ML						

Adrian R. Alonso (January 30, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
177:18	178:13	Spec, R, P, PK, H, ML	177:10	177:17	PK	177:2	177:9	H, PK, F, R
178:16	178:17	Spec, R, P, PK, H, ML						
183:9	183:15	R, C, PK, Spec, P, ML						
183:21	184:3	R, C, PK, Spec, ML						
186:9	187:13	Spec, R, P, PK, H, ML						
189:18	191:13	Spec, R, P, PK, H, ML						
192:6	194:16	Spec, R, P, PK, H, ML						
194:19	194:20	Spec, R, P, PK, H, ML						

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
11:13	11:19		7:9	7:14				
12:13	13:2							
15:9	15:21	P, R	15:22	16:1				
16:2	17:5	P, R, C						
17:7	17:9	P, R, C						
17:11	17:14							
18:6	18:10	P, R, C						
18:16	18:22		18:23	19:2	R, V, P			
19:10	19:14	P, R, C, spec						
19:16	19:25	P, R, C, spec						
20:23	21:6	R	21:7	21:15	R	21:16	21:18	R
21:19	22:4	R, spec, M						
24:14	24:15	R, PK, P, spec	24:1	24:13	R, NR, BSE			
24:17	25:13	R, PK, P, spec						
25:23	27:6	P, R, C, spec						
27:22	27:24		27:7	27:12	R, NR, V, M, P, C			

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
30:21	31:22	P, R, C, spec						
32:15	33:17	P, PK, R, C, spec						
33:19	33:21	P, PK, R, C, spec						
33:23	34:2	P, PK, R, C, spec						
34:7	35:10							
36:20	38:6	R, P						
38:13	39:6	R, P						
39:8	39:13	R, P						
44:14	46:21	R, P, C						
47:7	47:24	R, P, C						
49:4	51:6	R, P, C						
51:17	52:7	R, P, C						
52:16	54:4	R, P, C, H, PK						
56:9	56:23	R, P, PK, M, In	56:24	57:15	SP, H, P, PK			
58:17	58:19	R, P, PK, M, In						
58:23	58:23	R, P, C, H						
59:14	62:9	R, P, C						
62:25	63:6	R, P, C, H	62:10; 62:15	62:13; 62:24	IC R, NR			

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
64:1	67:23	R, P, C, H						
68:19	69:3	C	69:4; 69:8	69:5; 70:14	IC H, SP, P			
70:19	71:9	H, R, P, C						
71:24	72:10	H, R, P, C						
72:12	72:16	H, R, P, C, M						
74:9	75:3	H, R, P, C, M	73:12	73:21	PK, SP, V, R			
75:11	75:18	H, R, C						
77:6	77:24	H, C						
78:10	78:18	H, C						
78:25	79:23	H, C	79:7	79:23				
80:11	81:8	H, C						
81:18	82:5	H, R, P, C, M						
84:11	85:19	H, R, C, P						
89:7	89:9	R, C						
91:14	91:22	R, C						
92:17	92:23	R, C						
93:1	93:13	R, C						
94:16	94:18		94:19	94:21	SP, PK			

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
94:25	96:3	C						
96:13	96:16	C						
96:18	97:14	C						
98:2	98:5							
98:10	98:12	P, M, In	98:13	99:10	NR, V, PK, SP			
101:3	101:10							
102:1	103:13	R, C, P						
103:21	103:25	R, C, P						
105:16	107:2	R, C						
115:11	117:17	R, C, P						
117:19	118:20	R, C, P, Spec, PK, M						
118:22	119:1	R, C, P, Spec, PK, M						
119:9	119:13	R, C, P						
121:1	121:25	R, C, P, H						
126:25	127:4	R						
128:20	128:23	R, C, P						
128:25	129:6	R, C, P						

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
129:18	130:13	R, C, P						
131:18	132:10	R, C, P, H	132:11	132:23	NR, V, R			
132:24	132:25	R, C, P	133:1	133:2	C			
133:3	135:9	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M						
135:12	135:17	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M						
139:3	139:9	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M	139:13	139:15	R, NR, C			
139:16	139:20	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M						
139:22	139:23	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M						
140:3	142:3	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M						
142:22	143:15	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M	143:16	144:1	NR, C			
144:20	145:22	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M						
149:15	150:16	R, C, P, H						
151:5	153:20	R, C, P, H, Spec, PK, F, M	153:21	153:25				

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
160:3	160:9							
160:15	160:23							
161:11	161:12	C, R						
161:14	161:19	C, R						
166:10	166:13	C, R, P, M, In	166:14; 166:20	166:15; 166:23	IC NR, P, R, BSE			
167:22	168:7	H, C, P, R						
168:9	168:9	H, C, P, R						
168:14	169:13	H, C, P, R						
170:5	170:24	H, C, P, R, PK						
171:21	171:24	C, R						
172:20	173:18	C, R, H, PK	173:19	174:1	SP, PK			
177:14	177:24	H, C, P, R, PK	177:25	179:8	NR, R, SP, PK, BSE			
179:9	179:15	H, C, P, R, PK, In	179:16	180:6	NR, R			
180:7	180:11	H, C, P, R, PK						
182:13	183:6	H, C, P, R						
186:25	187:6	C, P, R						
188:2	188:21	C, P, R						
191:10	191:12	C, P, R						

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
191:15	191:22	C, P, R						
191:24	192:4	C, P, R						
192:18	193:4	C, P, R, In	193:12	195:1	H, NR, PK, SP	195:2 195:5	195:3 195:20	IC, NR, C
198:23	200:5	H, C, P, R						
203:4	204:1	C, In	204:2	204:13				
204:14	205:16	In						
206:21	207:18	In						
212:2	212:12	In						
212:22	215:3	H, R, P, C, PK						
216:7	216:25	H, R, P, C, PK						
217:7	220:25	H, R, P, C, PK, In	217:1	217:3				
221:4	221:18	H, R, C						
222:25	223:2	H, R, C						
223:23	224:19	H, R, C						
224:25	226:19	H, R, C						
227:16	227:23	R, C, PK, Spec						
228:2	228:15	R, C, PK, Spec						
234:11	235:4	H, R, C						

Chris Barrow (November 9, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
235:21	235:24	H, R						
236:9	236:12	R						
236:19	236:22	R, P, PK, Spec						
240:8	240:18	H, PK, F, R, P						
242:24	244:3	H, PK, F, R, P						
245:9	245:20	H, R, P, C						
247:20	247:25	H, R, P, C	248:1	248:11	H, SP			
250:22	252:9	H, R, P, C	250:17	250:21				
252:11	252:13	H, R, P, C						
254:21	256:17	H, R, P, C						
259:2	260:1	H, R, P, C						
262:1	262:18	H, R, P, C						
262:20	263:14	H, R, P, C						

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Christopher Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
4:10	4:13							
5:12	6:9	V, C						
6:16	7:2	F, V						
7:8	7:16							
8:10	8:18	V	8:23	8:25	V, NR			
9:1	9:10							
9:16	9:19	V						
9:24	10:8	V						
10:11	10:11							
11:17	11:24	R, P, C						
12:8	12: 11		12:12	12:14	R, V			
			12:18	12:19	R, V			
12:20	12:22		12:23	13:5	R, V			
13:6	13:24	R, P						
14:16	15:12	R, P						

Christopher Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
16:10	18:6	R, P, H, F, PK, Spec,	20:2	20:4	R, H			
			20:7	20:9	R, PK			
			20:12	20:12	R, PK			
21:1	21:5	R, P, H, F						
21:8	21:10	R, P						
21:13	21:13	R, P						
22:4	22:7	R, P, H, F						
22:16	22:20	R, P, H, F, PK, Spec						
23:1	23:21	R, P, H						
24:2	24:5	R, P, H, MD	24:9	24:12	V, PK, SP			
			27:10	27:20	V, PK			
24:20	25:1	R, P, H						
25:13	25:19	R, P, V						
26:2	26:8	R, P, H, F, PK, Spec, LC, 701	39:16	39:18	SP, PK, V, P			
			39:21	39:21	SP, PK, V, P			
26:18	26:21	R, P, M						
29:8	29:11	R, P	29:12	29:13	ID, R	30:22	30:25	R, P, C, M

Christopher Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			48:1	48:4	ID, R	30:22	30:25	R, P, C, M
32:22	33:19	R, P, F						
42:2	42:3	R, P						
42:14	42:22	R, P, H						
50:5	50:8	R, P						
50:18	50:22	R, P, H, F, PK	50:23	51:2	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			52:5	52:7	R, SP, PK, V, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	
			55:13	55:15	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	
			55:19	55:24	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	
			56:7	56:8	R, SP, PK, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	
			56:11	56:11	R, SP, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	
			57:7	57:13	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID, V	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	

Christopher Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			57:17	57:25	R, SP, PK, ID, V	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	
51:18	51:20	R, P, H	50:23	51:2	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			52:5	52:7	R, SP, PK, V, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			55:13	55:15	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			55:19	55:24	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			56:7	56:8	R, SP, PK, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			56:11	56:11	R, SP, Cmpd, ID	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			57:7	57:13	R, SP, PK, Cmpd, ID, V	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
			57:17	57:25	R, SP, PK, ID, V	53:25 54:8	54:4 54:8	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec
53:25	54:4	R, P, H, C						
54:20	54:24	R, P, F, PK, LC, 701, Spec, C						
55:2	55:7	R, P, F, PK, LC,						

Christopher Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		701, Spec, C						
55:12	55:12	R, P, F, PK, LC, 701, Spec, C						
58:19	58:22	R, P, V						
58:24	58:24	R, P						

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

David Carlson (September 28, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
6:19	6:22		20:20; 21:5; 21:12; 23:2; 23:18	21:2; 21:7; 22:9; 23:8; 23:22	R, BSE (for all)			
24:4	25:17	R	25:18; 183:9	26:9; 184:4	R, BSE (for all)			
26:10	26:20		25:18	26:9	R			
27:10	28:4	H, F, PK, Spec, 701, M, V						
28:6	28:6	H, F, PK, Spec, 701, V						
28:11	28:17	H, F, PK, Spec, NE, M						
34:16	37:1	H	30:12; 31:4; 32:1; 32:14; 37:2	30:24; 31:23; 32:6; 34:15; 37:3	BSE (for all) F, R, H, NT (for 32:14-34:15)			

David Carlson (September 28, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
37:13	37:22	H, P, M						
38:19	40:2	H, P, M						
40:8	41:6	P, PK, Spec, M	41:22	42:20	F, H, NR			
44:22	44:24		44:25	45:3	BSE, SP, PK			
45:4	45:25	R, IC	46:1; 48:15	48:13; 49:19	R			
66:21	66:23	R, P	72:5; 86:16; 163:14; 164:2; 184:6	72:20; 87:11; 163:23; 164:25; 184:11	BSE (for all) R (72:5-72:20) SP (for 164:2-25) ID (for 184:6-11)	165:1 165:6 165:10 166:9	165:2 165:8 166:5 166:9 (all for for 163:14- 163:23, 164:2- 164:25)	R, P, F, PK, Spec
88:5	88:20	R, P, PK, Spec, NE	88:21; 88:24	88:22; 89:5	R, SP, H, BSE (for all)			
93:11	93:23	PK, Spec	89:16; 90:20	89:24; 91:19	H, SP, BSE (for all)			
95:2	95:6	R, IC, PK, Spec, NE, M						
97:16	98:6							

David Carlson (September 28, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
101:4	101:11	PK, Spec, 701, LC, V						
101:17	101:19	PK, Spec, 701, LC						
101:23	101:25	PK, Spec, V						
102:9	103:16	PK, Spec, 701, LC, V	105:22; 106:7; 106:24; 108:7; 108:13; 110:23	106:4; 106:22; 107:6; 108:10; 109:3; 111:22	SP (105-106) F, BSE, (107-109, 110-111) R, BSE (110-111)	107:7 (for 106:24-107:6) 109:10	108:6 110:21 (for 108:13-109:3, 110:23-111:22)	C, F, PK, Spec, 702, LC, IC, ML
103:19	105:10	PK, Spec, 701, LC, V	105:22; 106:7; 106:24; 108:7; 108:13; 110:23	106:4; 106:22; 107:6; 108:10; 109:3; 111:22	SP (105-106) F, BSE, (107-109, 110-111) R, BSE (110-111)	107:7 (for 106:24-107:6) 109:10	108:6 110:21 (for 108:13-109:3, 110:23-111:22)	C, F, PK, Spec, 702, LC, IC, ML
116:15	116:19	R, PK	117:1;	117:13;	SP, PK, BSE, R (for	118:4	119:3 (for 117:1-13,	C, F

David Carlson (September 28, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			117:16; 119:4; 119:14; 119:22	117:18; 119:10; 119:20; 120:8	all)		117:16-18)	
120:12	120:16	M, V, 701, LC						
121:11	122:2	PK, Spec, 701, LC, V						
126:7	127:20	PK, Spec, 701, NE, V	128:20; 130:1	128:23; 131:4	BSE, F, V (for all) Also add ID, H, SP, PK for 130:1-131:4	128:24	129:25	R, C, F, PK, Spec
136:6	136:19	V	135:13; 135:18	135:16; 135:25	BSE, SP, PK (for all)			
161:20	161:21	V, ML	163:2	163:10	ID, SP, V, NR			
161:23	162:5	V, ML	163:2	163:10	ID, SP, V, NR			
162:18	162:21	V, ML, C	163:2	163:10	ID, SP, V, NR			
178:22	179:25	R, P, NE, V	177:20; 178:2	177:23; 178:12	SP, PK, BSE (for all)			
180:17	181:2	R, PK						
181:4	181:4	R, PK						

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

David Carlson (March 26, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
234: 10	235:1	R, P, PK, F						
274:22	275:3	P, Arg, C	277:19	278:1	F, SP, C			
275:12	275:25	H, P, C	277:19	278:1	F, SP, C			
302:7	302:19	F, H, P, C, AT, V	290:8 290:20 292:11 292:24 293:13 296:3 298:18 300:5 302:20 306:9	290:11 290:23 292:15 293:10 294:6 296:18 298:25 300:16 303:1 307:19	BSE (for all) F (292:11-15, 292:24-293:10, 293:13-294:6, 06:9- 307:19) SP (300:5-16, 306:9-307:19) V (300:5-16, 306:9- 307:19) NR (292:11-15, 292:24-293:10, 296:3-296:18; 298:18-298:25,			

David Carlson (March 26, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
					306:9-307:19) ID (296:3-296:18)			
334:12	334:17	C						
334:21	335:1	C, F	312:22	312:25				
345:13	345:18	C, F, V, LC	346:17 347:7	346:20 347:7	ID , V, SP (all for 347:7)	347:2	347:4 (for 347:7)	

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Christopher A. Ciarcia (December 14, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
7:22	7:25							
10:15	12:6		18:14	19:4				R, PK, Spec
			23:22	23:24				
			52:7	52:14		52:15	53:4	
			53:8	54:14				
84:24	85:23	R, Spec, V, IC	84:8 84:22 91:3 159:5	84:15 84:23 91:14 159:19				
85:25	86:4	R, Spec, V	159:5	159:19				
86:6	86:10	NR	86:20	86:25				
			87:3	87:22	NR			
			146:22	146:24				
			147:1	148:11	R			
			148:19	149:5	SP			
			161:11	162:20	SP; PK, F	162:21 163:2	162:24 163:11	F, MD, PK, Spec, LC, 702

Christopher A. Ciarcia (December 14, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						163:13	164:17	R, C
			164:18	164:19	SP; PK	162:21 163:2 163:13	162:24 163:11 164:17	F, MD, PK, Spec, LC, 702 R, C
			164:21	165:1	SP; PK; H	162:21 163:2 163:13	162:24 163:11 164:17	F, MD, PK, Spec, LC, 702 R, C
90:2	90:21	R, F, PK, Spec, C, IC	159:5	159:19				
112:25	113:4	F, PK, Spec	112:14	112:24				
113:6	113:24	F, PK, Spec, NR						
125:15	126:17	R, P	125:12 126:21 127:1 127:25 128:9 128:13 128:23	125:14 126:23 127:4 128:7 128:11 128:20 128:24				
129:1	129:8	R, P, PK, V						
129:10	129:12	R, P, PK, V						
129:14	129:16	R, P, PK, V						

Christopher A. Ciarcia (December 14, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
136:4	136:6	R, P, F, PK, Spec	135:20 138:3 138:13 138:16	135:21 138:10 138:14 138:19				
136:8	137:19	R, P, F, PK, Spec	135:20	135:21	ID	135:16	135:18	R, C, IC
			138:3	138:10	F, ID	137:22	138:2	R, C
			138:13	138:14	ID	138:15	138:15	
			138:16	138:19				
			141:9	141:10				
			141:13	141:16	NR			
			141:18	141:20				
			141:22	143:4				
			143:7	144:9	SP	145:14 145:19	145:16 145:22	M, F, Spec, 702, LC

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Dale Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
4:10	4:12							
6:12	6:22							
7:1	7:14	R, P, V	7:15	7:17	R, V			
7:18	8:3	R, P	7:15	7:17	R, V			
8:20	9:1							
10:1	10:5	F, NE, V						
10:12	10:16	C, PK, Spec	10:24	11:11	SP, PK, V			
11:25	13:22	H, V, PK, Spec	10:24	11:11	SP, PK, V			
			25:12	26:5	SP, PK, V, F			
			26:9	26:15	SP, PK, V, F			
14:2	14:7							
14:24	15:2	R, P						
15:13	15:15	V						
15:19	15:21	V						
16:5	16:10	R, P, V	16:11	16:13	R			
16:14	16:16		16:17	16:19	R, V			

Dale Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
16:25	18:13	F, PK, Spec, V	18:14	18:16	V			
18:17	18:24	R, P	18:14	18:16	V			
22:8	24:1	F, R, P, PK, Spec, V						
24:7	25:6	R, P						
26:6	26:8							
26:16	27:10	R, P	26:9	26:15	R, SP, PK, V, F			
			27:11	27:19	SP, V, F, R, P			
28:10	28:17							
29:7	30:9	R, P, H, F, PK, Spec, LC, 701, V	86:8	86:9	R, V, ID	84:22 85:13 85:24	85:11 85:14 86:7	R, P, C
			86:13	86:19	R, V, ID	84:22 85:13 85:24	85:11 85:14 86:7	R, P, C
30:24	31:15	IC						
32:8	32:25	R, P						
33:5	33:18	R, P, C, F, PK, Spec, M						
35:10	36:6	R, P, H, NR	36:7	37:3	R, V, H,			
			39:6	39:8	R, V, ID, BSE	39:2	39:5	R, P, C

Dale Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						39:9	39:12	
			39:13	39:17	R, V, ID, BSE	39:2 39:9	39:5 39:12	R, P, C
			68:8	68:14	R, V, H, SP			
			68:16	68:21	R, V, SP, PK, AT			
			68:25	69:5	R, V, SP, PK,			
			68:8;	68:10	R, V, SP, ID, F, IO			
			68:13	68:13	R, V, SP, ID, F, IO			
37:4	37:6	R, P, H						
37:15	37:16	R, P, H	37:17	37:18	ID, R, PK	37:19	37:20	R, P, C, PK, Spec
			37:21	37:22	ID, R	37:19	37:20	R, P, C, PK, Spec
37:23	39:1	R, P, H, M, F, PK, Spec, LC, 701, V	37:17	37:18	ID, R, PK	37:19	37:20	R, P, C, PK, Spec
			37:21	37:22	ID, R	37:19	37:20	R, P, C, PK, Spec
39:21	40:3	R, P	66:11	66:20	ID, R	40:4 65:7 66:4 66:21 67:11 67:17 67:21	40:12 67:20 66:10 66:25 67:15 67:19 67:21	R, P, C, V, F, PK, Spec, AT

Dale Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			67:6	67:10	ID, R	40:4 65:7 66:4 66:21 67:11 67:17 67:21	40:12 67:20 66:10 66:25 67:15 67:19 67:21	R, P, C, V, F, PK, Spec, AT
40:18	41:2	R, P, H	65:21	66:3	ID ,SP, PK, LD	40:4 65:7 66:4 66:21 67:11 67:17 67:21	40:12 67:20 66:10 66:25 67:15 67:19 67:21	R, P, C, V, F, PK, Spec, AT
42:14	42:25	R, P, H, F, M, MD						
44:10	45:6	R, P, H, V, M, MD, F, PK, Spec, IC	45:7	45:13				
45:14	45:17	R, P, H						
45:23	47:2	R, P, H, F, PK, Spec, M, MD	70:14	70:15	R, ID	69:20 70:9	70:6 70:13	R, P, C
			70:17;	70:17;	R, ID	69:20 70:9	70:6 70:13	R, P, C
			70:19;	70:21;	R, ID, SP, PK	69:20 70:9	70:6 70:13	R, P, C

Dale Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			70:23;	71:1;		69:20 70:9	70:6 70:13	
			71:3;	71:3;		69:20 70:9	70:6 70:13	
			71:9	71:14		69:20 70:9	70:6 70:13	
47:6	47:8	R, P, F, PK, Spec, M, MD						
49:16	50:14	R, P, H, F, LC, 701, V, MD	49:4	49:15	H, SP, ID	48:13 50:19 51:3	49:3 50:22 51:7	R, P, C, H, F, PK, Spec, LC, 701, V, MD, M
50:19	50:22	R, P, H, F, PK, Spec, IC	84:6	84:21	H, SP, PK	50:19 51:3	50:22 51:7	R, P, C, H, F, PK, Spec, LC, 701, V
51:4	51:19	R, P, H, F, PK, Spec, LC, 701, V, MD			H, SP, PK			
52:9	52:15	R, P, H, MD, M, F, LC, 701,	52:4	52:8	ID			
52:19	53:8	C, R, P, H, M						
54:12	54:16	R, P, H						
54:24	55:4	R, P, H						
56:25	57:9	R, P, H, F, PK, LC,						

Dale Thornberry (October 9, 2012)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		Spec, 701, MD						
58:17	58:24	R, P						
59:5	59:8	R, P						
63:19	64:21	R, P, PK, Spec						
69:14	69:16	R, P, V						
69:19	69:19	R, P, V						
72:8	72:16	R, P	72:17	72:18	ID, V, Cmpd, NT			
72:20	72:21	R, P						
72:23	73:2	R, P						
88:24	89:4		89:5	89:8	ID, SP,	49:16	50:14	R, P, H, F, LC, 701, V, MD

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
7:1	7:8	Personal (address)						
7:23	8:9							
11:2	12:4							
14:6	14:10	R						
14:17	15:4	R, P, ML, Char						
16:4	16:16	R, P, ML, Char						
17:9	17:14	R						
17:23	18:6	R, P, ML						
19:6	20:7	R, P, ML (19:6-10, 19:21-23)	20:9	20:13				
21:6	21:9	R, P						
21:23	22:2	ML						
22:8	22:18	ML, F						
22:22	22:24							
23:4	23:6	ML						
23:9	25:5	R, P (24:5-16)						

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
27:22	27:24		27:25	28:1	R			
28:11	29:7							
29:14	29:25							
30:16	30:24	In	30:25	30:25				
31:1	32:7	In	30:25	30:25				
34:6	34:20							
40:3	40:21							
44:14	45:11							
46:15	46:19							
47:1	47:4							
49:1	49:4							
51:7	51:16							
52:3	52:24	30(b)(6), R, P	55:14;	55:20;	R; C			
			56:2;	56:14	R; C			
			56:8	56:6;	R; C			
53:1	54:23	30(b)(6), R, P, Spec, PK	55:14;	55:20;	R; C			
			56:2;	56:6;	R; C			
			56:8	56:14	R; C			

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
54:25	54:25	30(b)(6)	55:14;	55:20;	R; C			
			56:2;	56:6;	R; C			
			56:8	56:14	R; C			
55:2	55:4	30(b)(6)	55:14;	55:20;	R; C			
			56:2;	56:6;	R; C			
			56:8	56:14	R; C			
57:23	58:11							
59:6	59:8		59:9	59:10				
59:20	60:22		60:23	60:25				
62:4	62:11		62:12;	62:16;				
			62:18	62:21				
62:22	63:3		62:12;	62:16;				
			62:18	62:21				
65:11	66:10	30(b)(6) (66:7-10)	66:16;	66:16;	SP; PK; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
			66:18;	66:18;	SP; PK; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
			68:12	69:21	R; NR; C; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
66:12	66:12	30(b)(6)	66:16;	66:16;	SP; PK; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
			66:18;	66:18;	SP; PK; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			68:12	69:21	R; NR; C; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
66:14	66:14	30(b)(6)	66:16;	66:16;	SP; PK; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
			66:18;	66:18;	SP; PK; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
			68:12	69:21	R; NR; C; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
66:19	66:22		68:12	69:21	NR; C; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
66:25	66:25		68:12	69:21	NR; C; IC	68:5	68:11	PK, Spec, R, P, V
69:23	70:9		70:10	70:21				
70:22	71:12		70:10	70:21				
72:8	73:14							
73:22	74:11							
75:24	76:7							
76:9	76:13		76:22	82:7	R; NR; C; P; IC	76:14	76:21	
82:8	82:21		76:22	82:7	R; NR; C; P; IC	76:14	76:21	
89:14	90:14							
90:20	91:6		91:7;	92:5;	R; C; NR			
			92:13;	92:22;	R; C; NR			
			93:22;	93:25;	R; C			
			94:2	94:13	R; C; NR			

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
92:6	92:12		91:7;	92:5;	R; C; NR			
			92:13;	92:22;	R; C; NR			
			93:22;	93:25;	R; C			
			94:2	94:13	R; C; NR			
92:23	93:8		91:7;	92:5;	R; C; NR			
			92:13;	92:22;	R; C; NR			
			93:22;	93:25;	R; C			
			94:2	94:13	R; C; NR			
93:10	93:21		91:7;	92:5;	R; C; NR			
			92:13;	92:22;	R; C; NR			
			93:22;	93:25;	R; C			
			94:2	94:13	R; C; NR			
94:14	94:21		91:7;	92:5;	R; C; NR			
			92:13;	92:22;	R; C; NR			
			93:22;	93:25;	R; C			
			94:2	94:13	R; C; NR			
99:10	100:20	AT (99:21), R, P (99:20, 99:22-100:20)						

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
100:22	100:23	R, P						
104:7	104:16	In, R, P	94:22;	95:5;		95:6	95:13	
			101:21;	102:9;		102:10	103:11	C, R, P
			103:18	103:21		103:23	104:1	C, R, P, 30(b)(6)
105:2	105:12		105:13	105:18				
109:14	109:19		108:21	109:5	NT; H; 1002; IC	109:6	109:8	C, R, P, 30(b)(6)
109:22	110:1	AT						
113:13	113:18	In	113:19;	113:20;				
			113:22	113:25	NR			
114:1	114:2	In	114:7	114:13				
114:4	114:6		114:7	114:13				
114:14	115:4	AT (115:1), 30(b)(6), F (114:25, 115:2-3, 115:4)	114:7	114:13				
115:6	115:15	30(b)(6), F (115:6-7)						
115:17	115:22							

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
115:24	116:6							
117:10	118:8							
118:16	119:12							
120:20	121:11							
121:20	121:23							
123:1	123:21		122:18	122:25	NT			
124:25	125:15		123:25	124:3	R			
126:7	126:18		126:19	126:19				
133:18	134:7							
137:11	137:19							
138:19	139:2							
139:10	139:20		139:6	139:9	NT			
140:5	140:9							
141:18	142:9	In (142:1-7), 30(b)(6) (142:8-9)						
142:12	142:19	30(b)(6) (142:12-14, 142:15-19)						
142:22	143:1	30(b)(6) (142:22)						
143:3	143:7							

Matthew Quilter (October 18, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
143:9	144:14	AT (144:9)	144:15;	144:20;				
			144:22	145:1	NR			
146:18	147:4							
151:15	151:20	R, P, PK						
156:9	156:12	R, P, F	156:3;	156:4;				
			156:6	156:8				
156:15	156:15	R, P, F						
160:10	160:22	R, P, F						
161:1	161:7	R, P, C						

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
6:15	6:22							
7:4	7:10							
8:7	8:9		8:10 15:18	8:20 16:17	R, NR, BSE R, NR, BSE			
8:21	9:19							
9:24	10:4	R	13:14 14:4	14:1 14:7	R, V R, V			
11:18	11:22	R	13:14 14:4	14:1 14:7	R, V R, V			
11:24	12:2	R	13:14 14:4	14:1 14:7	R, V R, V			
14:16	14:23	R, V	13:14 14:4	14:1 14:7	R, V, NR, BSE R, V, NR, BSE			
18:6	18:7	F, V	18:8	18:10	R			
18:11	18:14	F, V	18:8	18:10	R			
18:25	19:5		18:8	18:10	R			
19:13	19:16	V						

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
19:17	19:17	IC	19:18 20:1	19:23 20:2				
20:3	20:4		19:18 20:1	19:23 20:2	R, NR, V R, NR, V			
20:10	20:19	V	19:18 20:1	19:23 20:2	R, NR, V, BSE R, NR, V, BSE			
20:22	21:2	V						
21:3	21:4	V	21:6	21:9				
21:10	22:8	R, V	21:6	21:9				
22:21	23:13	R, P, F, NE	22:9	22:20	R			
23:22	24:1	R, P, F						
24:6	24:11	V	24:12	24:20	R, V, SP			
24:21	25:5	F, V						
25:7	25:7	V						
25:9	25:16	V						
26:18	26:25	M, V, Cmpd	25:18; 26:13	26:2; 26:17	R, V R, V	26:3 26:3	26:12 26:12	C
27:12	28:1							
28:2	28:3	M						

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
28:5	28:17	V						
28:18	28:19	V, NE						
28:21	29:4	Cmpd, PK						
29:6	29:11							
34:1	34:15	R, P, C, V						
36:22	37:6	R, P	35:22 35:25 37:9 38:11	35:23 36:8 37:17 38:22	R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE			
37:7	37:7	R, P, C	35:22 35:25 37:9 38:11	35:23 36:8 37:17 38:22	R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE			
37:25	38:2	R, P, C	35:22 35:25 37:9 38:11	35:23 36:8 37:17 38:22	R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE R, P, V, NR, BSE			
39:23	40:1	F	38:23 39:10	39:6 39:12	R, V, NR, BSE R, V, NR, BSE			
40:12	41:3	PK, F, Spec, V						

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
41:8	41:23							
42:4	42:15	M						
43:4	43:7	M						
43:10	43:13	F						
43:15	44:3	PK, V						
44:13	44:13	V	44:17 48:7	44:21 48:15	R, V R, V, NR, BSE, P			
44:15	44:16		44:17	44:21				
45:22	46:6	R, C, V						
46:16	46:18	C, M, V, Arg						
46:21	47:1	R, C	48:7	48:15	R, M, P			
47:2	47:3	R, C, V	48:7	48:15	R, M, P			
47:5	47:9	C, R, V	48:7	48:15	R, M, P			
47:11	47:11		48:7	48:15	R, M, P			
48:17	49:3	R, C, V	49:13	49:19	V, M			
51: 6	51:8	P	50:22	51:5	R, F, PK, V			
54:16	54:18	R, P						
54:22	55:3	R, P, C	55:4	55:14	R, F, V, NR, BSE			
55:20	55:22	R, P, C, IC	55:23	56:3	R, NR, BSE			

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
56:10	56:12	R, P, C						
56:14	56:17	R, P, C						
56:25	57:5	P, C, PK						
58:16	58:18	P, C						
59:7	59:14	V						
59:16	60:10							
60:21	60:23	V, LC, F						
61:1	61:4	V, F						
61:6	61:19	V, LC, F, PK, Spec						
62:12	62:13	LC						
62:16	63:4	V						
63:13	63:25	V						
64:13	64:14	V						
64:16	65:11	R, V	65:12 65:14	65:12 65:17	V, M, R, NR, BSE V, M, R, NR, BSE			
66:8	67:1	R, P, PK, Spec	67:2	62:3	R, NR, BSE			
67:4	67:19	R, P	68:11 68:14 69:11	68:12 69:4 69:12	R, V R, V R, V R, V	67:24 67:24 67:24	68:10 68:10 68:10	C, V, M

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			69:14	69:16	R, V	67:24	68:10	
72:6	72:12	R, P						
73:3	73:6	R, P, Cmpd						
73:8	73:13	R, P	73:19	73:25	R, V	73:14 73:17	73:15 73:18	R, C, P, F, NE, A
73:8	73:13	R, P	74:3	74:13	R, V	73:14 73:17	73:15 73:18	R, C, P, F, NE, A
74:22	74:25	R, P						
76:6	76:8	F, PK, Spec, V, LC						
76:15	77:15	F, PK, Spec						
77:19	77:25	V, LC						
78:3	78:4	R, P						
78:9	79:5	M, V, F, PK, Spec						
79:7	79:18	F, PK, Spec, C						
79:20	80:8	V, LC						
80:11	80:11							
82:2	82:17	R, F, PK, Spec						
82:19	82:22	F, PK, Spec, V						
82:25	83:5							

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
85:2	85:8	F, PK, Spec						
85:10	85:15	F, PK, Spec						
87:15	87:16	R, F, V	87:19	87:25	R, V, P	88:1 88:3	88:1 88:3	R, C
87:18	87:18	R, F, V	87:19	87:25	R, V, P	88:1 88:3	88:1 88:3	R, C
88:5	88:20	R, P, M, V						
88:23	89:6	R, P						
89:12	89:14	R, F, LC						
89:16	89:22	R, F, PK, Spec						
90:4	90:13	R, C	91:5	95:11	R, V, PK, NT, LC, F, C, IC, H, P, AT			
91:21	91:24	R, F, LC						
92:2	92:4	R, F	92:5 92:7 92:15	92:5 92:13 92:16	R, V, F, LC, P R, V, F, LC, P R, V, F, LC, P			
93:5	93:12							
96:12	96:14							
96:22	96:25							
97:2	97:2							

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
97:5	97:10	R, P						
98:14	98:16	R, P						
99:2	99:5	R, P						
99:15	99:18	R, P, F, LC						
99:21	99:23	R, P						
100:15	100:18	R, P						
100:25	101:8	R, P, F, LC						
101:11	101:11	R, P	101:12 101:16	101:13 101:18	LC, R, V LC, R, V			
101:19	102:11	R, P, C	101:12 101:16	101:13 101:18	LC, R, V LC, R, V			
103:8	103:12	R, P, F, C						
103:14	103:23	R, P, F, LC, PK, C						
104:1	104:3	R, P, F, LC, PK, C						
104:5	104:5	R, P, C						
105:13	105:17	R, P, C						
105:22	105:22	R, P, F, LC, PK, C						
105:25	106:2	R, P, F, LC, PK, C						
106:12	106:19	R, P, F, LC, PK, C	108:4	108:12	R, V, NR, BSE			

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			108:18	109:6	R, V, NR, BSE			
106:22	106:22	R, P, C	108:4 108:18	108:12 109:6	R, V, NR, BSE R, V, NR, BSE			
108:14	108:17	R, P, C	108:18	109:6	R, V, PK, NR, BSE			
111:22	112:14	F, LC, PK						
115:20	115:21	R, F, LC, PK, V						
115:24	115:24	R						
117:4	117:12	R						
117:19	117:19	F						
117:21	118:2							
118:7	118:23	IC						
122:10	122:14	F, PK, Spec, IC						
112:16	123:12	F, LC, PK, V, AT, M						
124:18	124:21	F, PK, Spec						
125:5	125:22	F, PK, Spec						
126:3	127:13	F, PK, MD						
128:10	128:13	F, PK, Spec, M, Arg						
128:15	128:17	F, PK, Spec, Arg						

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
128:19	130:1	F, PK, Spec, Arg, C						
130:3	130:7	F, PK, Spec, C						
130:9	131:18	F, PK, Spec, V, C						
131:20	131:24	F, PK, Spec, V, C						
132:2	132:8	F, V, C	132:9 132:14	132:11 133:1	V, M, R, NR, BSE V, M, R, NR, BSE			
133:10	133:11	F, PK, Spec	133:17 133:22	133:20 133:24	V, R, NR, BSE V, R, NR, BSE			
133:13	133:16	F, PK, Spec	133:17 133:22	133:20 133:24	V, R, NR, BSE V, R, NR, BSE			
135:8	135:9	V	135:22 136:16	135:25 136:21	R, F R, F			
135:11	135:21		135:22 136:16	135:25 136:21	R, F R, F			
136:1	136:6		135:22 136:16	135:25 136:21	R, F R, F			
136:23	137:8		137:9	137:11	R, F			
137:12	138:5	F, MD						
138:8	138:13	F, MD, V						
138:16	139:8	F, MD, V	139:9	139:10	V, R, F			

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			139:13	139:18	V, R, F			
141:13	141:17	V, NE, Cmpd, C						
141:20	142:10	C	142:11	142:13	R, V			
142:14	143:10	C	142:11	142:13	R, S, V			
145:24	145:25	F, PK, Spec, V	146:5	146:15	R, V			
			147:5	147:15	R, V			
146:2	146:4	F, PK, Spec	146:5	146:15	R, V			
			147:5	147:15	R, V			
150:22	151:3		45:2	45:10	R, F, V, NR, BSE			
			151:4	151:11	R, F, V			
151:12	152:7	R, P, M	151:4	151:11	R, F, V			
			152:8	152:8	R, F, V			
			152:10	152:10	R, F, V			
152:11	152:17	R, P	152:8	152:8	R, F, V			
			152:10	152:10	R, F, V			
152:23	152:25	F, M, V, LC	153:4	153:17	R, F, V			
153:3	153:3		153:4	153:17	R, F, V			
153:18	153:20	F, M, V, ML	153:4	153:17	R, F, V			
153:23	153:23	F, V, ML						
155:13	155:16	F, V, ML	155:22	156:7	M, V, R, F			

John Keane (December 12, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
155:18	155:21	F, PK, V, ML	155:22	156:7	M, V, R, F			
156:18	157:3	V, ML	162:7 162:18	162:16 163:14	M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP			
157:5	158:16	F, PK, Spec, ML	162:7 162:18	162:16 163:14	M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP			
158:18	158:19	V, ML	162:7 162:18	162:16 163:14	M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP			
158:21	158:25	ML	159:15 162:7 162:18	160:13 162:16 162:18	M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP			
159:1	159:14	Cmpd, ML	159:15 162:7 162:18	160:13 162:16 162:18	M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP M, P, F, NR, BSE, SP			

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
7:18	7:20							
9:10	9:13							
10:4	10:14							
10:18	11:20							
14:10	14:11							
14:16	14:19							
22:4	22:15		28:2;	28:15;	IC; F; V, SP, PK	54:12 54:19 126:3	54:16 54:21 126:10	IC, IN, R, P
			44:12;	44:18;	IC; V; PK; Compd; SP; NE; F; R; P	54:12 54:19	54:16 54:21	IC, IN, R, P
			44:25;	44:25;	IC; V; PK; Compd; SP; NE; F; R; P	54:12 54:19	54:16 54:21	IC, IN, R, P
			45:2;	45:10;	V; R; F	54:12 54:19	54:16 54:21	IC, IN, R, P
			56:2;	56:5;	IC; V; Arg; LC; F;	54:12	54:16	IC, IN, R, P

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
					SP; NE; P	54:19	54:21	
			56:9;	56:9;	IC; V; Arg; LC; F; SP; NE; P	54:12 54:19	54:16 54:21	IC, IN, R, P
			67:10;	67:12;				
			67:14;	68:6;	IC; 1002			
			68:18;	69:14;	M; F; NE; PK; SP; IC	69:15	69:20	
			69:21;	70:5;	V			
			70:19;	70:24;	IC; SP; V; F	54:12 54:19 71:14 71:17	54:16 54:21 71:15 71:18	IC, IN, R, P
			71:2;	71:2;	IC; SP; V; F	54:12 54:19 71:14 71:17	54:16 54:21 71:15 71:18	IC, IN, R, P
		71:4;	71:6;	IC; F; V; SP; PK	54:12 54:19 71:14 71:17	54:16 54:21 71:15 71:18	IC, IN, R, P	
		71:12;	71:12;	IC; F; V; SP; PK	54:12	54:16	52:12-16, 54:19-	

Matthew Levin (January 22, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						54:19 71:14 71:17	54:21 71:15 71:18	
			71:20;	71:22;		54:12 54:19 71:14 71:17	54:16 54:21 71:15 71:18	
			72:2;	72:2;		54:12 54:19 71:14 71:17	54:16 54:21 71:15 71:18	
			97:18	98:21	IC; PK; SP; LD	54:12 54:19 98:22	54:16 54:21 99:2	52:12-16, 54:19-21: IC, IN, R, P
27:23	28:1							
126:3	126:10		126:11	126:18	F; V, SP, PK	126:3	126:10	

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Todd M. Long (January 31, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
8:10	8:21							
59:16	59:21	In	59:9	59:15	PK; IC	59:22	59:22	C, PK, R, P, V
						59:25	60:6	
						60:12	60:13	
						60:16	60:19	
			61:13	61:17	PK; IC	59:22	59:22	C, PK, R, P, V
						59:25	60:6	
						60:12	60:13	
						60:16	60:19	
			61:24	62:8	PK; IC	59:22	59:22	C, PK, R, P, V
						59:25	60:6	
						60:12	60:13	
						60:16	60:19	
121:14	121:18	In	120:15	121:10	NR			
			121:12	121:13	NR			
121:20	121:25	In	120:15	121:10	NR			
			121:12	121:13	NR			
135:7	137:11	AT, R, P, C						

Todd M. Long (January 31, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
135:13	135:13	Subsumed by above (135:7-11)						
135:15	135:24	Subsumed by above (135:7-11)						
143:18	145:12	In, R, P, C	143:15	143:17				
145:15	145:18	In, R, P, C	143:15	143:17				
153:19	153:23	R, P, C						
154:10	154:19	R, P, C						
155:11	155:14	R, P, C						
155:16	155:20	R, P, C, Spec						
155:23	156:2	R, P, C, Spec						
156:5	156:6	R, P, C, Spec						
156:7	156:7	R, P, C						
156:9	156:13	R, P, C						
156:16	156:16	R, P, C						
157:14	157:16	R, P, C, Spec	157:3	157:13	AT; NR			
157:19	157:20	R, P, C, Spec	157:3	157:13	AT; NR			
175:24	176:8	R, P, C, Spec						
176:17	176:25	R, P, C, Spec						

Todd M. Long (January 31, 2018)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
181:16	181:18	R, P, C						
182:15	182:18	R, P, C	182:8	182:14	AT; NR			
182:20	183:3	R, P, C	182:8	182:14	AT; NR			

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
21:12	21:21		6:17	6:18				
34:17	34:23		34:25	35:4				
			36:1	36:3				
86:9	86:21		87:25	88:7	F, NE, SP, ID	91:6 108.23	91:16 109:15	F, V, Spec
87:4	87:24	AT: 87:9-87:10	87:25	88:7	F, NE, SP, ID	91:6 108.23	91:16 109:15	F, V, Spec
92:13	93:5	ML: 92:13-92:25	92:5	92:12	V, ID	91:6 91:25	91:16 92:4	F, V, Spec
114:8	114:19	Spec, F, ML, P	113:22	113:25	ID, H, F, NE, SP, PK, M	114:2	114:2	
			114:4	114:7	ID, H, F, NE, SP, PK, M	114:2	114:2	
			114:20	114:23				
			115:10	115:13	H, F, SP, PK, ID	85:11 114:16 115:14	85:16 114:19 115:17	P, R, ML H
			116:22	118:2	F, NE, SP, PK, H, V, M, L, ID	115:18 115:23 117:7	115:20 115:25 117:8	F, V, Spec, C, PK F, V, Spec, C, PK
			118:18	118:20	ID, F, SP, PK	118:24	119:1	
			119:2	119:5	ID, F, SP, PK	118:24	119:1	
			144:5	144:11	ID, V, SP, PK, R	143:7 143:13 144:12	143:10 144:4 144:19	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec F, V, Spec

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						144:21 145:3	144:25 145:7	F, V, Spec F, V, Spec
167:18	169:4	F, P, ML, V, AT: 167:23-167:24	167:6	167:7	F, V, NE, F, SP			
			167:13	167:16	F, V, NE, F, SP, ID	167:18 167:25	167:22 169:4	F, V, Spec F, P, V, ML
			169:7	169:8	F, SP, PK, V			
			169:13	169:23	F, SP, PK, V			
			170:17	170:20	F, SP, PK, V, NE, P, ID	171:5	171:8	
			170:24	171:2	F, SP, PK, V, NE, P, ID	171:5	171:8	
			174:15	174:19	R, SP, V, ID	174:20	174:24	
			174:25	175:2	F, NE, SP, PK, ID	174:20	174:24	
			175:5	175:7	F, NE, SP, PK, ID	174:20	174:24	
			175:9	175:14	F, NE, SP, PK, V	174:20	174:24	
			176:25	177:4	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V			
			177:8	177:8	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V, ID	177:11 177:16	177:13 177:20	F, V, PK, Spec F, V, PK, Spec, P
187:1	187:25	F, Spec	176:25	177:4	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V			
			177:8	177:8	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V, ID	177:11 177:16	177:13 177:20	F, V, PK, Spec F, V, PK, Spec, P
188:1	188:13	F, Spec, C, AT: 188:5-188:7	176:25	177:4	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V			
			177:8	177:8	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V, ID	177:11 177:16	177:13 177:20	F, V, PK, Spec F, V, PK, Spec, P
207:18	208:9	V, AT: 208:3-	211:11	211:15	ID, NE, V, SP, PK,	211:16	211:21	F, Spec, R, P

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
		208:5; 207:18-207:19			F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			211:22	212:5	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			212:10	212:14	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			212:21	212:24				
210:8	210:15	F, Spec, Char	211:11	211:15	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	211:16 212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	211:21 212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			211:22	212:5	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			212:10	212:14	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			212:21	212:24				
212:15	212:20	F, Spec	211:11	211:15	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	211:16 212:15	211:21 212:20	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec, R, P

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						212:25 213:7 213:12	213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			211:22	212:5	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			212:10	212:14	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
212:25	213:18	F, Spec, AT: 213:5-213:6	211:11	211:15	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	211:16 212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	211:21 212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			211:22	212:5	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			212:10	212:14	ID, NE, V, SP, PK, F	212:15 212:25 213:7 213:12	212:20 213:4 213:10 213:18	F, Spec, R, P F, Spec F, Spec F, Spec
			176:25	177:4	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V			
			177:8	177:8	F, M, NE, SP, PK, V, ID	177:11 177:16	177:13 177:20	F, V, PK, Spec F, V, PK, Spec, P
228:10	228:25	F, Spec	233:9	233:16	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7	231:13	Spec, V

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						236:2 237:5	236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V
			234:5	234:8	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			234:11	234:14	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			234:22	235:2	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			235:4	235:8	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			235:10	235:13	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			235:16	235:18	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
238:13	238:18	F, Spec, R, P, Char	233:9	233:16	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			234:5	234:8	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			234:11	234:14	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			234:22	235:2	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			235:4	235:8	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			235:10	235:13	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			235:16	235:18	1002, F, Spec, PK	231:7 236:2 237:5	231:13 236:11 237:12	Spec, V Spec, V Spec, V
			260:4	260:12	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			261:25	262:5	M, V, R, P, F, SP,	261:6	261:9	F, Spec, R, V, C, IC

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
					PK, LC, Arg			
250:24	251:8	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char	249:23	250:6				
			260:4	260:12	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			261:25	262:5	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg	261:6	261:9	F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			263:25	264:5	F, SP	264:6	264:12	F, Spec, V
252:11	254:17	F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char, AT: 253:11-253:12	260:4	260:12	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						261:6	261:9	F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			261:25	262:5	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg	261:6	261:9	F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
255:8	255:20	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char	260:4	260:12	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			261:25	262:5	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg	261:6	261:9	F, Spec, R, V, C, IC

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
255:25	256:22	F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char	260:4	260:12	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			261:25	262:5	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg	261:6	261:9	F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			263:25	264:5	F, SP	264:6	264:12	F, Spec, V
258:8	258:21	F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char	260:4	260:12	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25	255:20 256:22	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			261:25	262:5	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg	261:6	261:9	F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			263:25	264:5	F, SP	264:6	264:12	F, Spec, V
279:23	281:4	Spec, P, F, AT: 280:7-280:8	279:13	279:22	R, SP, PK, NE, V, F, P, H, ID	279:23 280:9	280:6 281:4	Spec, P, F Spec, P, F, C
			281:22	281:25	R, NE, F, ID	281:5	281:21	Spec, P, F, C
			282:14	282:25	V			
			291:16	291:19	ID, SP, IO, 701, V, R, P, LC, F, NE, PK	291:14	291:15	Spec, F, V, IC
			291:23	292:4	ID, SP, IO, 701, V, R, P, LC, F, NE, PK	291:14	291:15	Spec, F, V, IC
			293:19	294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC			
284:14	288:25	F, Spec, P, C, AT: 284:19-284:21; 286:13-286:16; 287:2-287:3; 287:12-287:14; 287:22-287:24; 288:22-288:23	279:13	279:22	R, SP, PK, NE, V, F, P, H, ID	279:23 280:9	280:6 281:4	Spec, P, F Spec, P, F, C
			281:22	281:25	R, NE, F, ID	281:5	281:21	Spec, P, F, C
			282:14	282:25	V			
			291:16	291:19	ID, SP, IO, 701, V,	291:14	291:15	Spec, F, V, IC

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
					R, P, LC, F, NE, PK			
			291:23	292:4	ID, SP, IO, 701, V, R, P, LC, F, NE, PK	291:14	291:15	Spec, F, V, IC
			293:19	294:1	V, F, R, P, NE, SP, PK, LC			
303:24	304:21	F, H, Spec, R, P, C, Char	260:4	260:12	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			260:18	260:21	M, V, R, P, F, SP, PK, LC, Arg, ID	255:8 255:25 257:8 257:20 259:15 259:20 259:23 261:6	255:20 256:22 257:16 259:13 259:16 259:20 260:16 261:9	F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, R, P, C, Char F, Spec, ML, R, P, C, H, Char F, Spec, V, R R, F, V, R F, Spec, Char, R F, Spec, R, V, C, IC
			304:23	304:25				
			305:5	305:8				
341:12	341:20	Spec, R, Char, V	348:13	348:22	R, C, P, ID	349:22	349:24	
			348:25	349:21	R, C, P, ID	349:22	349:24	
			357:4	357:12	R, C, P			
			341:21	341:22	F, SP, PK			
			341:25	342:3	F, SP, PK			
342:13	342:16	Spec, R, V, F, Char	348:13	348:22	R, C, P, ID	349:22	349:24	

James Loveland (November 29, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			348:25	349:21	R, C, P, ID	349:22	349:24	
			357:4	357:12	R, C, P			
			342:17	343:9	F, SP, PK			
365:23	366:3	Spec, F, V, R, Char, AT: 345:24-366:1	366:14	366:16	V, SP, R, C, ID	365:23 366:2	365:23 366:3	Spec, F, V, R, Char Spec, F, V, R, Char
			366:18	366:19	V, SP, R, C, ID	365:23 366:2	365:23 366:3	Spec, F, V, R, Char Spec, F, V, R, Char

EagleView Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.,
Case No. 15-cv-7025 (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Affirmative Deposition Designations, Plaintiff's Counter-Designations, and Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations, and Objections Thereto

Jason Pawlick (December 5, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
5:8	5:13							
7:1	7:11							
11:21	11:25							
12:2	12:12							
22:5	22:19							
29:6	29:10		29:11	29:25	SP, R	188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
30:12	30:23		30:24	31:2	V, PK, R			
34:21	35:14		34:11	34:20	V	34:21	35:14	
			97:5	97:16	ID, PK, F, A, Cmpd, SP, H	188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
			97:18	98:10	V, ID, PK, SP, F, A	188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
36:22	37:10							
39:6	39:20							
65:7	66:20	66:12-13-AT	66:21	66:24	ID, V, SP, PK	188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
111:13	111:17							
118:10	118:15							

Jason Pawlick (December 5, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
121:12	121:14		120:24	121:2	ID, M, H, V, F, 1002	120:12 120:16 120:20 188:12	120:13 120:17 120:22 188:22	188:12-188:22 - IC, F, R
			121:5	121:8	1002, H, V, F	120:12 120:16 120:20 188:12	120:13 120:17 120:22 188:22	188:12-188:22 - IC, F, R
			121:15	121:17		121:24	122:15	
			122:16	122:19	H, 1002	126:10	127:2	
			123:7	123:12	ID, 1002, H, V	126:10	127:2	
			124:1	124:4	H, 1002, V, Compd, PK	124:5 126:10	124:9 127:2	
			124:13	124:22	ID, V, H, 1002, F	126:10	127:2	
			127:14	127:16	1002, H, V, F			
			129:10	130:11	ID, R, PK, SP, V, LD	130:12 130:15 131:1 131:7 131:15	130:13 130:24 131:5 131:8 131:17	

Jason Pawlick (December 5, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
			153:11	153:18	ID, PK, F, A, 1002, H	153:1 153:24	153:5 154:1	R, PK
124:10	124:12		120:24	121:2	ID, M, H, V, F, 1002	120:16 120:20	120:17 120:22	
			121:5	121:8	1002, H, V, F	120:16 120:20 188:12	120:17 120:22 188:22	
			121:15	121:17		121:24	122:15	
			122:16	122:19	H, 1002	126:10	127:2	IC, C, P, R, F
			123:7	123:12	ID, 1002, H, V	126:10	127:2	
			124:1	124:4	H, 1002, V, Cmpd, PK	124:5	124:9	
			124:13	124:22	ID, V, H, 1002, F	126:10	127:2	
			127:14	127:16	1002, H, V, F			
			129:10	130:11	ID, R, PK, SP, V, LD	130:12 130:15 131:1 131:7 131:15	130:13 130:24 131:5 131:8 131:17	
			153:11	153:18	ID, PK, F, A	152:25	153:5	IC, In, M, P, R

Jason Pawlick (December 5, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						153:24	154:1	
126:10	127:2		120:24	121:2	ID, M, H, V, F, 1002	120:12 120:16 120:20 188:12	120:13 120:17 120:22 188:22	
			121:5	121:8	1002, H, V, F	120:12 120:16 120:20 188:12	120:13 120:17 120:22 188:22	IC, C, P, R, F
			121:15	121:17		120:12 120:16 120:20 188:12	120:13 120:17 120:22 188:22	IC, C, P, R, F
			122:16	122:19	H, 1002	126:10	127:2	IC, C, P, R, F
			123:7	123:12	ID, 1002, H, V	126:10	127:2	IC, C, P, R, F
			124:1	124:4	H, 1002, V, Cmpd, PK	124:5	124:9	IC, C, P, R, F, H
			124:13	124:22	ID, V, H, 1002, F	126:10	127:2	IC, C, P, R, F
			127:14	127:16	1002, H, V, F			
			129:10	130:11	ID, R, PK, SP, V, LD	130:12 130:15	130:13 130:24	R, C, IC

Jason Pawlick (December 5, 2017)								
Defendants' Designations		Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations		Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations		Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Counter-Counter Designations
Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End		Line Start	Line End	
						131:1 131:7 131:15	131:5 131:8 131:17	
			153:11	153:18	ID, PK, F, A	152:25 153:24	153:5 154:1	R, PK
183:8	183:20	R, F, V	183:21	184:2		188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
184:3	184:5	R, F, V	183:21	184:2		188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
184:7	184:8	R, F, V	183:21	184:2		188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
193:5	193:25	193:5-13-C	194:1	194:7		188:12	188:22	IC, F, R
			169:3	169:14	ID, R, Cmpd, V, R	168:4 188:12	169:2 188:22	188:12-22 - IC, F, R
			169:16	169:18		188:12	188:22	188:12-22 - IC, F, R

Plaintiff's Objections Key

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
A	Authentication or Identification (FRE 901) The requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.
Arg	Argumentative
AT	Attorney Objections Not Removed
BS	Beyond the Scope of Direct / Cross / Redirect Examination
30(b)(6)	Beyond the Scope of the Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Topic
C	Cumulative, Duplicative, Wasteful or Undue Delay (FRE 403) Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of duplicative and/or cumulative evidence.
Char	Improper Character Evidence (FRE 404)
Cmpd	Compound
Dem Only	Demonstrative / Should Not Be Admitted Into Evidence
D	Not Produced During Discovery
F	Lack of Foundation (FRE 602) Objectionable because a witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter.
H	Hearsay Rule (FRE 802) Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority or by Act of Congress.

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
I	<p>Incomplete Document (FRE 106)</p> <p>Objectionable because document is incomplete and the introduction of the remaining portions or related documents ought, in fairness, to be considered contemporaneously with it.</p>
IC	Improper Designation / Counter Designation (FRE 106: FRCP 32(a)(6))
ID	Incomplete Document (FRE 106)
In	Incomplete Testimony (FRE 106; FRCP 32(a)(6))
L	Lack of Personal Knowledge or Competency (FRE 602)
LA	Limited Admissibility (Admissible for Some Purposes but Not Others) (FRE 105)
LC	Legal Conclusion
LD	Leading (FRE 611)
LF	Lack of Foundation (FRE 103, 104 and/or 105)
M	Misleading/Mischaracterizes Prior Testimony (FRE 401-403, 611)
MD	Mischaracterizes Underlying. Document (FRE 401-403, 611)
ML	Subject to Motion In Limine
NE	Assumes Facts Not In Evidence
NR	Nonresponsive
NT	Not Testimony
O	Improper Lay or Expert Opinion (FRE 701-703)
OC	Offer to Compromise, Settlement (FRE 408)

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
P	<p>Prejudicial, Confusing, Vague and/or Misleading (FRE 403)</p> <p>Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.</p>
PD	<p>Post Dated Filing Date (FRE 105)</p> <p>If post-dated evidence is admitted as to one purpose but not admissible as for another purpose (e.g., for obviousness analysis), the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.</p>
PK	<p>Lack of Personal Knowledge (FRE 602)</p> <p>Objectionable because lack of personal knowledge makes the witness incompetent to testify about particular facts.</p>
R	<p>Relevance (FRE 401, 402)</p> <p>All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible.</p>
Spec	<p>Calls for Speculation (FRE 602)</p>
S	<p>Summaries (FRE 1006)</p> <p>The party relying on the summary must establish its accuracy to the court's satisfaction.</p> <p><i>See Graham, Handbook of Federal Evidence § 1006.1 (5th ed. 2001). United States v. Pelullo, 964 F.2d 193, 204 (3d Cir. 1992) ("It is well established that summary evidence is admissible under Rule 1006 only if the underlying materials upon which the summary is based are admissible.").</i></p>
U	<p>Untimely / Never Produced (FRCP 26, 37)</p>
V	<p>Vague / Ambiguous/Overbroad (FRE 611)</p>
W	<p>Privileged / Work Product (FRE 501/502)</p>
X	<p>Exhibit has not been provided, the copy provided is illegible, and/or the entry includes multiple documents.</p>

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
Y	Wrong Document Identified or Incorrectly Described
105	<p>Limited Admissibility (FRE 105)</p> <p>When evidence which is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.</p>
701	<p>Improper Lay Opinion Testimony (FRE 701)</p> <p>If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an opinion is limited as provided by this rule.</p>
1002	<p>Best Evidence (FRE 1002, 1003, 1004)</p> <p>An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless these rules or a federal statute provides otherwise.</p>

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

ABBREV.	OBJECTION	RULE / EXPLANATION
A	Authentication or Identification (FRE 901)	The requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.
Arg	Argumentative	
AT	Attorney Objections Not Removed	
BSE	Beyond Scope of Direct / Cross / Or Redirect Examination	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope of the direct, cross, or redirect examination.
BSS	Beyond Scope of Subpoena	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope of the subpoena
BST	Beyond Scope of Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Topic	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope for which the witness was designated to testify pursuant Rule 30(b)(6).
C	Cumulative, Duplicative, Wasteful or Undue Delay (FRE 403)	Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of duplicative and/or cumulative evidence.
Char	Improper Character Evidence (FRE 404)	
Cmpd	Compound	
D	Not Produced During Discovery	
F	Lack of Foundation (FRE 602)	Objectionable because a witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter.
H	Hearsay Rule (FRE 802)	Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority or by Act of Congress.
I	Incomplete Document (FRE 106)	Objectionable because document is incomplete and the introduction of the remaining portions or related documents ought, in fairness, to be considered contemporaneously with it.
ID	Improper/Incomplete Designation (FRCP 32(a)(6))	Objectionable because additional parts of the testimony in fairness should be considered with the part of the testimony designated.
IC	Improper/Incomplete Counter Designation (FRCP 32(a)(6))	Objectionable because additional parts of the testimony in fairness should be considered with the part of the testimony designated.
IO	Improper Lay or Expert Opinion (FRE 701-703)	Objectionable because the testimony is outside the scope of proper lay or expert testimony.
IP	Improper Use of Deposition Testimony (FRCP 32)	Objectionable because the designation is inconsistent with the proper use of deposition testimony pursuant to FRCP 32.
IDe	Improper Designation of Witness who will be Called Live	Objectionable because the witness who gave the designated testimony will be called to testify at trial.
LC	Legal Conclusion (FRE 403)	Objectionable because witness testimony constituting a legal conclusion creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

		the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
LD	Leading (FRE 611)	Objectionable because leading questions should not be used on direct examination except as necessary to develop the witness's testimony.
M	Mischaracterizes Prior Testimony (FRE 401-403, 611)	Objectionable because the designation includes mischaracterization of prior testimony, as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
MD	Mischaracterizes Underlying Document	Objectionable because the designation includes mischaracterization of an underlying document, as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
NE	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence	Objectionable because the question assumes facts not in evidence.
NR	Nonresponsive	Objectionable because the designated testimony is not responsive to the question.
NT	Not Testimony	Objectionable because the designated material is not testimonial.
OS	Offer of Settlement (FRE 408)	Evidence of an offer of consideration to compromise or attempt to compromise a claim, or conduct or a statement made during compromise negotiations about the claim, is not admissible.
P	Prejudicial, Confusing, Vague and/or Misleading (FRE 403)	Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.
PK	Lack of Personal Knowledge (FRE 602)	Objectionable because lack of personal knowledge makes the witness incompetent to testify about particular facts.
PR	Privilege (FRE 501-502)	The evidence is subject to a claim of attorney-client privilege or other privilege.
R	Relevance (FRE 401, 402)	All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence that is not relevant is not admissible.
SP	Calls for Speculation	Objectionable because the designation includes a question calling for speculation and/or speculation as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
S	Summaries (FRE 1006)	The party relying on the summary must establish its accuracy to the court's satisfaction. <i>See</i> Graham, Handbook of Federal Evidence § 1006.1 (5th ed. 2001). <i>United States v. Pelullo</i> , 964 F.2d 193, 204 (3d Cir. 1992) ("It is well established that summary evidence is admissible under Rule 1006 only if the underlying materials upon which the summary is based are admissible.").
V	Vague, Ambiguous or Overbroad (FRE 611)	
105	Limited Admissibility (FRE 105)	When evidence that is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.
701	Improper Lay Opinion	If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

	Testimony (FRE 701)	opinion is limited as provided by this rule.
1002	Best Evidence (FRE 1002)	An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless the rules or a federal statute provide otherwise.
PD	Post Dated Filing Date (FRE 105)	If post-dated evidence is admitted as to one purpose but not admissible as for another purpose (<i>e.g.</i> , for obviousness analysis), the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.
Badgering	Badgering the Witness	Inappropriate badgering of the witness.
X		Exhibit has not been provided, the copy provided is illegible, and/or the entry includes multiple documents.
Y	Wrong Document Identified or Incorrect Description of Document	
MIL	Motion in Limine	Subject to motion in limine.

Robert Louis Stevenson

Curriculum Vitae

Contact 275 Fitzpatrick Hall
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Tel.: +1 574-631-8308
Fax: +1 574-631-4393
EMail: rls@nd.edu

WWW: <http://engineering.nd.edu/profiles/rstevenson>

Professional Experience

10/2013–Present Associate Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

08/2002–Present Professor
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

01/2003–6/2017 Professor
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

08/1996–08/2002 Associate Professor
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

08/1996–06/1997 Visiting Associate Professor
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware

06/1994–08/1994 Research Associate
Intel Corporation, Hillsboro, Oregon

05/1993–08/1993 Research Associate
Air Force Office of Scientific Research
Rome Laboratories, Griffiss AFB, Rome, New York

08/1990–08/1996 Assistant Professor
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

08/1989–08/1990 Graduate Research Assistant
School of Electrical Engineering
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana

08/1986–08/1990 Graduate Teaching Assistant
School of Electrical Engineering
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana

06/1986–08/1986 Intern
Engineering Physics Laboratory, E. I. duPont
de Nemours & Company, Wilmington, Delaware

06/1985–08/1985 Intern
Corporate Technology Center
Sperry Corporation, Reston, Virginia

Education

08/1986–08/1990 *Ph.D., Electrical Engineering*, August 1990
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
Thesis: *Invariant Reconstruction of Curves and Surfaces with Discontinuities with Applications in Computer Vision*
Advisor: Professor Edward J. Delp
GPA: 6.0/6.0

09/1982–06/1986 *B.S.E.E., Electrical Engineering*, June 1986
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware
Thesis: *On the Theoretical Properties of Morphological Filters*
Advisor: Professor Gonzalo R. Arce
GPA: 4.0/4.0

Honors and Awards

1983 University of Delaware, Tau Beta Pi Prize

1984 University of Delaware, Engineering Scholar

1985–1986 University of Delaware, Liston A. Houston Scholarship

1986 IEEE Delaware Bay Section Engineering Award

1986 Valedictorian, University of Delaware
 1986 Purdue University Graduate Instructor Fellowship
 1986 Phi Kappa Phi Graduate Fellowship
 1986–1990 DuPont Graduate Fellowship in Electrical Engineering
 1986–1989 National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship
 1993 Dept. of Electrical Engineering Outstanding Teacher Award
 2012 ICIP 2012 Outstanding Reviewer
 2013 IS&T 2013 Service Award

Honor Societies

1985–Present Eta Kappa Nu, Electrical Engineering Honor Society
 1985–Present Tau Beta Pi, Engineering Honor Society
 1985–Present Phi Kappa Phi, Academic Honor Society

Professional Activities

Associate Editor

IEEE Trans. on Image Processing, 1999–2003
IEEE Trans. on Circuits and Systems for Video Tech., 1997–2002
Journal of Electronic Imaging, 1995–1998

Special Issue Editor

Multimedia Systems, *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, 04/1996
 Still Image Compression, *Electronic Imaging Newsletter*, 01/1996

Best Paper Award Board Membership

IEEE Trans. on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology, 2002

Symposium Chairman

SPIE/IS&T Symposium on Electronic Imaging, 02/2004

Conference Chairman

IS&T Conf. Computational Imaging XVI, 02/2019
 IS&T Conf. Computational Imaging XV, 02/2018
 IS&T Conf. Computational Imaging XIV, 02/2017
 IS&T Conf. on Visual Information Proc. & Comm. VIII, 02/2017
 IS&T Conf. on Visual Information Proc. & Comm. VII, 02/2016
 SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Visual Information Proc. & Comm. VI, 02/2015
 SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Visual Information Proc. & Comm. V, 02/2014

SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Visual Information Proc. & Comm. IV, 02/2013
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Visual Information Proc. & Comm. III, 01/2012
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Visual Information Proc. & Comm. II, 01/2011
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Visual Comm. and Image Processing, 01/2009
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Computational Imaging, 02/2003
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Image and Video Comm. and Proc., 02/2000
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Visual Comm. and Image Processing, 02/1999
41st Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems, 08/1998
SPIE Conf. on Electronic Imaging and Signal Processing, 11/1996
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Still Image Compression II, 02/1996
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Image and Video Processing IV, 02/1996
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Image and Video Processing III, 02/1995
SPIE/IS&T Conf. on Image and Video Processing II, 02/1994

Steering Committee Member

Visual Communications and Image Processing, 1998–2010
Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems, 1994–1999
Electronic Imaging, 2003–2005

Organizing Committee Member

Nonlinear Signal and Image Processing Workshop, 2001

Technical Program Committee

International Conference on Image Processing, 1998 – Present
SPIE Computational Imaging, 2003–2016
Visual Communications and Image Processing, 1997–2008
European Signal Processing Conference, 2015
IEEE Symposium on Industrial Electronics & Applications, 2012
International Conference on Multimedia & Expo, 2009–2010
Image and Video Communications and Processing III, 2005
Computational Imaging, 2004
International Conference on Pattern Recognition, 2000
Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech, & Signal Proc., 2000, 2006–Present
International Symposium on Circuits and Systems, 1998, 2005
9th IEEE Image and Multi. Signal Processing Workshop, 1996
Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems, 1994

Member

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, IEEE
Society of Photographic Instrumentation Engineers, SPIE
The Society for Imaging Science and Technology, IS&T

Panel Member for the following funding agencies

National Science Foundation

Reviewer for the following funding agencies

National Science Foundation

U.S. Army Research Office

Israel Science Foundation

Hong Kong Research Grants Council

Kentucky EPSCoR Program

North Dakota EPSCoR Program

Louisiana Board of Regents

Reviewer for the following archival journals

IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing

IEEE Transactions on Image Processing

IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems

IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology

IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement

IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging

IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence

IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics

IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks

Pattern Recognition Letters

Signal Processing Letters

Computer Vision, Graphics, and Image Processing

Journal of the Optical Society of America

Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision

Applied Optics

IET Image Processing

Reviewer for the following textbook companies

Van Nostrand Reinhold, Electrical Engineering Division

McGraw-Hill, College/Schaum Division

MacMillan Publishing Company

Prentice Hall

Publications

Journals

R. L. Stevenson and G. R. Arce, "Binary Display of Hexagonally Sampled Continuous-Tone Images," *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, Vol. 2, pp. 1009–1013, July 1985.

G. R. Arce and **R. L. Stevenson**, "On the Synthesis of Median Filter Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, Vol. CAS-34, No. 4, pp. 420–429, April 1987.

R. L. Stevenson and G. R. Arce, "Morphological Filters: Statistics and Further Syntactic Properties," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, Vol. CAS-34, No. 11, pp. 1292–1305, November 1987.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Invariant Recovery of Curves in M-Dimensional Space from Sparse Data," *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 480–490, March 1990.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Viewpoint Invariant Recovery of Visual Surfaces from Sparse Data," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 14, No. 9, pp. 897–909, September 1992.

R. L. Stevenson and S. M. Schweizer, "A Nonlinear Filtering Structure for Image Smoothing in Mixed Noise Environments," *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, Vol. 2, No. 2/3, pp. 137–154, November 1992.

R. L. Stevenson, G. B. Adams, L. H. Jamieson and E. J. Delp, "Parallel Implementation for Iterative Image Restoration Algorithms on a Parallel DSP Machine," *Journal of VLSI Signal Processing*, Vol. 5, No. 2/3, pp. 261–272, April 1993.

R. L. Stevenson, B. E. Schmitz, and E. J. Delp, "Discontinuity Preserving Regularization of Inverse Visual Problems," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 455–469, March 1994.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Improved Definition Image Expansion," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 233–242, May 1994.

T. P. O'Rourke and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Human Visual System Based Wavelet Decomposition for Image Compression," *Journal of Visual Communications and Representation*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 109–121, June 1995.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Stochastic Modeling and Es-

timization of Multispectral Image Data,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, Vol. 4, No. 8, pp. 1109–1119, August 1995.

B. E. Schmitz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Color Palette Restoration,” *CVGIP: Graphical Models and Image Processing*, Vol. 57, No. 5, pp. 409–419, September 1995.

S. Choi, R. R. Schultz, **R. L. Stevenson**, Y. Huang, and R. Liu, “Contrast Enhancement of Missile Video Sequence via Image Stabilization and Product Correlation,” *Optical Engineering*, Vol. 35, No. 12, pp. 3495–3507, December 1995.

T. P. O’Rourke and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Improved Image Decompression for Reduced Transform Coding Artifacts,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp. 490–499, December 1995.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Extraction of High-Resolution Frames from Video Sequences,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, special issue on Nonlinear Image Processing, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp. 996–1011, June 1996.

R. L. Stevenson, “Inverse Halftoning via MAP Estimation,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 574–583, April 1997.

B. E. Schmitz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Enhancement of Sub-Sampled Color Image Data,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, special issue on Color Image Processing, Vol. 6, No. 7, pp. 1052–1056, July 1997.

R. R. Schultz, L. Meng, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Subpixel Motion Estimation for Super-Resolution Image Sequence Enhancement,” *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, special issue on High-Fidelity Media Processing, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 38–50, March 1998.

R. Llados-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Fixed Length Entropy Coding for Robust Video Compression,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, Vol. 8, No. 6, pp. 745–755, October 1998.

R. Llados-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Edge Assisted Upper Band

Coding Techniques”, *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology*, Vol. 10, pp. 67–75, January 1999.

Z. Peng, Y.-F. Huang, D. J. Costello, Jr., and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Pyramidal Image Coder Using Generalized Rank-Ordered Prediction Filter”, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits & Systems for Video Technology*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 540–544, June 1999.

M. A. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Reduced-Complexity Iterative Post-Filtering of Video,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* Vol. 11, No. 10, pp. 1121–1128, October 2001.

M. A. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Temporal Resolution Enhancement in Compressed Video Sequences,” *EURASIP Journal on Applied Signal Processing*, Special Issue on Nonlinear Signal Processing, pp. 230–238, December 2001.

B. E. Marino and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Improving the Performance of Single Chip Image Capture Devices,” *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 209–218, April 2003.

M. A. Robertson, S. Borman, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Estimation-Theoretic Approach to Dynamic Range Improvement Through Multiple Exposures,” *Journal of Electronic Imaging* Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 219–228, April 2003.

R. Magill, C. E. Rohrs, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Output-Queued Switch Emulation by Fabrics with Limited Memory,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, Special Issue on High-Performance Electronic Switches/Routers for High-Speed Internet, Vol. 21, No. 4., pp. 606–615, May 2003.

M. A. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “DCT Quantization Noise in Compressed Images,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 27–38, January 2005.

J. Gai and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Studentized Dynamical System for Robust Object Tracking,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 186–199, January, 2011.

J. Gai and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Robust Contour Tracking Based On

A Coupling Between Geodesic Active Contours and Conditional Random Fields,” *Journal of Visual Communications and Image Representations*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 22-47, January 2011.

J. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Parameterized Spatially-Varying PSF Model,” *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, Vol. 23, No. 1, January, 2014.

Y. Li, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Incorporating Global Information in Feature-Based Multimodal Image Registration,” *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, Vol. 23, No. 2, March-April 2014.

Y. Li, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Similarity Metric for Matching Incomplete Edge Curves,” *International Journal of Machine Intelligence and Sensory Signal Processing*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 153-173, 2014.

L. Hollmann and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Pole-Zero Placement Algorithm for the Design of Digital Filters with Fractional-Order Rolloff,” *Signal Processing special issue on fractional signal processing and applications*, Vol. 107, pp. 218-229, February 2015.

R. Zhen, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Multi-Image Motion Deblurring Aided By Inertial Sensors,” *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, Vol. 25, No. 1, February 2016 .

Y. Li, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Multimodal Image Registration With Line Segments By Selective Search,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, Vol. PP, No. 99, April 2016.

L. Hollmann and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Adaptive whitening of ambient ocean noise with narrowband signal preservation” *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 129, No. 6, pp. 3122, 3133, June, 2016.

R. Zhen and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Inertial Sensor Aided Multi-Image Nonuniform Motion Blur Removal Based on Motion Decomposition,” *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, Vol. 27, No. 5, October, 2018.

Y. Li, L. Wang, **R. L. Stevenson**, L. Wei, and R. Fan, “Reliable Line Segment Matching for Multispectral Images Guided by Intersection Matches,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*.

J. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, “An Efficient Method for Non-Blind Estimation of Spatially-Varying Point Spread Functions,” submitted to *Journal of Electronic Imaging*.

Journals Articles Reprinted in Books

R. L. Stevenson and G. R. Arce, “Binary Display of Hexagonally Sampled Continuous-Tone Images,” originally appeared as *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, Vol. 2, pp. 1009–1013, July 1985, reprinted in *Selected Papers on Digital Halftoning*, SPIE Milestone Series, Vol. MS 154, J. Allebach, Ed., 1999.

Book Chapters

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, “Investigation into Building an Invariant Surface Model from Sparse Data,” in *NATO ASI: Active Perception and Robot Vision*, A. Sood and H. Wechsler, Eds., Springer Verlag, pp. 539–558, 1992.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, “Three-Dimensional Surface Reconstruction: Theory and Implementation,” in *3D Object Recognition Systems*, A. K. Jain and P. J. Flynn, Eds., Elsevier, pp. 89–114, 1993.

D. L. Cohn and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Using Redundancy to Speed up Disk Arrays,” in *Communications and Cryptography: Two Sides of One Tapestry*, R. E. Blahut, D. J. Costello, Jr., U. Maurer and T. Mittelholzer, Eds., Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 59–68, 1994.

R. Llados-Bernaus, M. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Stochastic technique for the removal of artifacts in compressed images and video”, in *Signal Recovery Techniques for Image and Video Compression and Transmission*, A. K. Katsaggelos and N. P. Galatsanos, Eds., Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998.

S. Borman and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Image Sequence Processing,” in *Dekker Encyclopedia of Optical Engineering*, R. B. Johnson, C. Hoffman, and R. G. Driggers, Eds., Marcel Dekker, Inc., 2003.

R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Bayesian Image and Video Enhancement Using a Non-Gaussian Prior,” in *Nonlinear Signal and Image Processing: Theory, Methods, and Applications*, K. Barner and G.

Arce, Eds., CRC Press, 2003.

J. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, “An Introduction to Super-Resolution Imaging,” in *Mathematical Optics: Classical, Quantum, and Imaging Methods*, V. Lakshminarayanan, Ed., Taylor & Francis Books, Inc., 2012.

J. Simpkins, **R. L. Stevenson**, and S. Borman, “Image Sequence Processing,” in *Encyclopedia of Optical Engineering*, R. G. Driggers and C. Hoffman, Eds., Taylor & Francis., 2015.

R. Zhen and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Image Demosaicing,” *Color Image and Video Enhancement*, pp. 13–54, Springer, 2015.

Edited Conference Proceedings

S. A. Rajala and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Image and Video Processing II*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 1994.

R. L. Stevenson and S. A. Rajala, Eds., *Image and Video Processing III*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 1995.

R. L. Stevenson and M. I. Sezan, Eds., *Image and Video Processing IV*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 1996.

R. L. Stevenson, A. Drukarev, and T. R. Gardos, Eds., *Still Image Compression II*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 1996.

C.-S. Li, **R. L. Stevenson**, and L. Zhou, Eds., *Electronic Imaging and Multimedia Systems*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 1996.

R. L. Stevenson, Ed., *Proceeding of the Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, 1998.

K. Aizawa, **R. L. Stevenson**, and Y.-Q. Zhang, Eds., *Visual Communications and Image Processing '99*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 1999.

B. Vasudev, T. R. Hsing, A. G. Tescher, and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Image and Video Communications and Processing 2000*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2000.

C. Bouman and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Computational Imaging 2003*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2003.

M. Rabbani and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Visual Communications and Image Processing 2009*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2009.

A. Said, O. G. Guleryuz, and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Visual Information Processing and Communication II*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2011.

A. Said, O. G. Guleryuz, and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Visual Information Processing and Communication III*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2012.

A. Said, O. G. Guleryuz, and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Visual Information Processing and Communication IV*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2013.

A. Said, O. G. Guleryuz, and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Visual Information Processing and Communication V*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2014.

A. Said, O. G. Guleryuz, and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Visual Information Processing and Communication VI*, SPIE Proceedings Series, 2015.

A. Said, O. G. Guleryuz, and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Visual Information Processing and Communication VII*, IS&T, 2016.

R. L. Stevenson and E. Delp, Eds., *Visual Information Processing and Communication VIII*, IS&T, 2017.

C. Bouman and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Computational Imaging XIV*, IS&T, 2017.

C. Bouman and **R. L. Stevenson**, Eds., *Computational Imaging XV*, IS&T, 2018.

Conference Papers

G. R. Arce and **R. L. Stevenson**, "On the Synthesis of Median Filter Systems," *Proceedings of the 1986 Princeton Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*, pp. 711–716, Princeton, New Jersey, March 1986.

R. L. Stevenson and G. R. Arce, "Theoretical Analysis of Morphological Filters," *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pp. 353–362, Allerton, IL, October 1986.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Investigation into Building an Invariant Surface Model from Sparse Data," *NATO ASI on Active Perception and Robot Vision*, Maratea, Italy, July 16–29, 1989.

R. L. Stevenson, "Machine Vision Systems for Component Assembly and Measurements," *Proceedings of the Fluid Power Technical Update Seminar*, pp. 98–107, West Lafayette, IN, August 2–4, 1989.

J. Song, **R. L. Stevenson**, and E. J. Delp, "The Use of Mathematical Morphology in Image Enhancement," *Proceedings of the 32nd Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 67–70, Urbana, IL, August 14–16, 1989.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Invariant Reconstruction of Visual Surfaces," *Proceedings of the IEEE Workshop on the Interpretation of 3D Scenes*, pp. 131–137, Austin, TX, November 27–29, 1989.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Fitting Curves with Discontinuities," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Workshop on Robust Computer Vision*, pp. 127–136, Seattle, WA, October 1–3, 1990.

R. L. Stevenson, G. B. Adams, L. H. Jamieson and E. J. Delp, "Three-Dimensional Surface Reconstruction on the AT&T Pixel Machine," *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, pp. 544–548, Pacific Grove, CA, November 5–7, 1990.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Invariant Reconstruction of 3D Curves and Surfaces," *Proceedings of the SPIE Conference on Intelligent Robots and Computer Vision*, pp. 364–375, Boston, MA, November 4–9, 1990.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Viewpoint Invariant Recovery of Visual Surfaces from Sparse Data," *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 309–312, Osaka, Japan, December 4–7, 1990.

R. L. Stevenson and E. J. Delp, "Surface Reconstruction with Discontinuities," *Proceedings of the SPIE Conference on Curves and Surfaces in Computer Vision and Graphics II*, pp. 46-57, Boston, MA, November 10-15, 1991.

R. L. Stevenson, "A Nonlinear Estimation Technique for Filtering Images Corrupted with Gaussian Noise," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Nonlinear Image Processing III*, pp. 210-221, San Jose, California, February 9-14, 1992.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Improved Definition Image Expansion," *Proceedings of the 1992 International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. III:173-176, San Francisco, California, March 23-26, 1992.

J. Wang, **R. L. Stevenson**, and Richard R. Schultz, "Recovery of Image Information from Halftone Information," *Proceedings of the Fifth Digital Signal Processing Workshop*, pp. 6.3.1-6.3.2, Starved Rock State Park, IL, September 13-16, 1992.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Parameter Estimation for Discontinuity- Preserving Stochastic Signal Models," *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pp. 319-328, Allerton, IL, September 30 - October 2, 1992.

S. M. Schweizer and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Predetection of Impulse Locations in a Mixed Noise Environment," *Proceedings of the Third Annual Argonne Symposium for Undergraduates in Science, Engineering and Mathematics*, p. 73, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, November 6-7, 1992.

S. M. Schweizer and **R. L. Stevenson**, "A Bayesian Approach to Inverse Halftoning," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Human Vision, Visual Processing and Digital Display IV*, pp. 282-292, San Jose, CA, January 31 - February 5, 1993.

R. L. Stevenson, "Reduction of Coding Artifacts in Transform Image Coding," *Proceedings of the 1993 International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. V:401-404, Minneapolis, MN, April 27-30, 1993.

T. P. O'Rourke and **R. Stevenson**, "Human Visual System Based Subband Image Compression," *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pp. 452-461, Allerton, IL, September 29 – October 1, 1993.

B. E. Schmitz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Parameter Estimation for the Curve Recovery Problem," *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pp. 485-494, Allerton, IL, September 29 – October 1, 1993.

M. A. Lexa and **R. Stevenson**, "Filtering Video Sequences using Non-linear Techniques," *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Argonne Symposium for Undergraduates in Science, Engineering and Mathematics*, p. 83, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, November 5-6, 1993.

M. P. Witzman, R. R. Schultz and **R. Stevenson**, "Computation of MAP Signal Estimates using a Gradient Descent Window Operator," *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Argonne Symposium for Undergraduates in Science, Engineering and Mathematics*, p. 84, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, November 5-6, 1993.

T. P. O'Rourke and **R. Stevenson**, "Improved Image Decompression for Reduced Transform Coding Artifacts," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Processing, II*, pp. 90-101, San Jose, CA, February 6-10, 1994.

R. R. Schultz, S. Choi, **R. L. Stevenson**, Y. Huang, R. Liu and L. Morine, "Contrast Enhancement of Missile Data Through Image Sequence Stabilization and Product Correlation," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Processing, II*, pp. 164-175, San Jose, CA, February 6-10, 1994.

B. E. Schmitz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Color Palette Restoration," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Human Vision, Visual Processing and Digital Display, V*, pp. 327-338, San Jose, CA, February 6-10, 1994.

R. R. Schultz, H. M. Zayed, **R. L. Stevenson**, R. J. Minniti and G. H. Bernstein, "ASIC Design for Robust Signal and Image Processing," *Proceedings of the Fourth Great Lakes Symposium on VLSI*, pp. 138-143, Notre Dame, IN, March 4-5, 1994.

T. L. Piatt and **R. L. Stevenson**, “The Use of Block-Matching Motion Estimation in Image Filtering,” appeared at the *National Conference on Undergraduate Research*, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, April 14-16, 1994.

M. P. Witzman, R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Computation of Partial Signal MAP Estimates,” appeared at the *National Conference on Undergraduate Research*, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, April 14-16, 1994.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Stochastic Modeling and Estimation of Multispectral Image Data,” *Proceedings of the 1994 International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. V:373–376, Adelaide, Australia, April 19–22, 1994.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Window-Based Bayesian Estimator for Noise Removal,” *Proceedings of the 37th Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 860–863, Lafayette, LA, August 3–5, 1994.

R. R. Schultz, **R. L. Stevenson**, and A. Lumsdaine, “Maximum Likelihood Parameter Estimation for Non-Gaussian Prior Signal Models,” *Proceedings of the 1994 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. II:700–704, Austin, TX, November 13–16, 1994.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Video Resolution Enhancement,” *Proceeding of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Processing, III*, pp. 23-34, San Jose, CA, February 5–10, 1995.

J. Squyres, A. Lumsdaine, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Cluster-Base Image Processing,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Processing, III*, pp. 228-239, San Jose, CA, February 5–10, 1995.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Improved Definition Video Frame Enhancement,” *Proceedings of The 1995 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 2169–2172, Detroit, MI, May 9–12, 1995.

T. P. O’Rourke, **R. L. Stevenson**, L. Perez, D. J. Costello, Jr., and Y.-F. Huang, “Robust Transmission of Compressed Images over Noisy Gaussian Channels,” *Proceedings of The 1995 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 2319–2322, Detroit, MI, May 9–12, 1995.

R. L. Stevenson and R. R. Schultz (invited), "Extraction of High-Resolution Frames from Video Sequences," *IEEE Workshop on Non-linear Image Processing*, pp. 718–721, Greece, June 20–22, 1995.

J. Squyres, A. Lumsdaine, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "A Parallel Image Processing Toolkit Using MPI," *Proceedings the MPI Developers Conference*, <http://www.cse.nd.edu/mpidc95/>, Notre Dame, IN, June 22–23, 1995.

R. L. Stevenson, "Reduction of Coding Artifacts in Low-Bit-Rate Video Coding," *Proceedings of the 1995 Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 854–857, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 1995.

B. E. Schmitz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Color Space Expansion," *Proceedings of the 1995 Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 133–136, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 1995.

T. P. O'Rourke, **R. L. Stevenson**, D. J. Costello, Jr. and Y.-F. Huang, "Improved Decoding of Compressed Images Received over Noisy Channels," *Proceedings of the 1995 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. II:65–68, Washington, DC, October 1995.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Motion Compensated Scan Conversion of Interlaced Video Sequences," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Processing IV*, pp. 107–118, San Jose, CA, February 1996.

B. E. Schmitz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Enhancement of Sub-Sampled Color Image Data," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Processing IV*, pp. 97–106, San Jose, CA, February 1996.

T. P. O'Rourke, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Vector Quantization with Distance Constraints for Enhanced Post-Processing," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Still Video Compression II*, pp. 9–20, San Jose, CA, February 1996.

J. M. Squyres, A. Lumsdaine, B. C. McCandless, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Parallel and Distributed Algorithms for High Speed Image Processing," *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Dual-Use Technologies & Applications Conference*, pp. 185–190, Syracuse, NY, June 1996.

J. Brockman, S. Batill, J. Renaud, J. Kantor, D. Kirkner, P. Kogge, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Development of a Multidisciplinary Engineering Design Laboratory at the University of Notre Dame," *Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference*, Washington, D.C., June 1996.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Sub-Pixel Motion Estimation," *Proceedings of the 1996 Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 1385–1388, Ames, Iowa, August 1996.

R. Llados-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Reduction of Coding Artifacts in Video Compression," *Proceedings of the SPIE Internal Conference on Electronic Imaging and Signal Processing*, pp. 2–10, Beijing, China, November 1996.

R. Llados-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, "A Robust Low-Bit Rate 3D Subband Codec," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Internal Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing*, pp. 610–521, San Jose, CA, February 1997.

R. R. Schultz, L. Meng, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Subpixel Motion Estimation for Multiframe Resolution Enhancement," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Internal Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing*, pp. 1317–1328, San Jose, CA, February 1997.

M. J. Wahoske, R. W. Liu, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Dual-Receiver Blind Identification for Image Blurs," *Proceedings of the 1997 IEEE International Conference on Circuit and Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 1377–1380, Hong Kong, June 1997.

R. Llados-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Addition of Robustness to Standard Video Compression Protocols", *Proceedings of the IEEE Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 921–924, Sacramento, CA, August 1997.

R. Llados-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Fixed Length Entropy Coding for Robust Video Compression", *Proceedings of the IEEE International on Image Processing*, Vol. II, pp. 97–100, Santa Barbara, CA, October 1997.

R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Bayesian Estimation of Subpixel-Resolution Motion Fields and High-Resolution Video Stills," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Vol.

III, pp. 62–65, Santa Barbara, CA, October 1997.

J. He, D. Costello, Y. F. Huang, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “On the Application of Turbo Codes to the Robust Transmission of Compressed Images,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Vol. III, pp. 559–562, Santa Barbara, CA, October 1997.

Z. Peng, Y. F. Huang, D. Costello, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Image Compression using Region-Activity-Based Pyramidal Coding and Iterative Vector Quantizer,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Vol. III, pp. 698–701, Santa Barbara, CA, October 1997.

R. Lladós-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Edge-Assisted Upper Bands Coding Techniques”, *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T International Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing*, pp. 2–13, San Jose, CA, January 1998.

Z. Peng, Y. F. Huang, D. Costello, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Joint Source/Channel Decoding for Image Transmission – A Turbo Code Approach,” *Proceedings of the Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*, pp. 330–335, Princeton, NJ, March 1998.

R. Lladós-Bernaus and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Codeword Assignment for Fixed-Length Entropy Coded Video Streams”, *IEEE Data Compression Conference*, pp. 269–275, Snowbird, UT, March 1998.

R. R. Schultz and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Estimation of Subpixel-Resolution Motion Fields from Segmented Image Sequences”, *Proceedings of the SPIE International Conference on Sensor Fusion: Architectures, Algorithms, and Applications II*, pp. 90–101, Orlando, FL, April 1998.

Z. Peng, Y. F. Huang, D. Costello, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Joint Channel and Source Decoding for Vector Quantized Images using Turbo Codes,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. IV:5–8, Monterey, CA, May 1998.

J. M. Squires, A. Lumsdaine and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Toolkit for Parallel Image Processing, *Proceedings of the SPIE International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Methods for Image Processing II*, pp. 69–71, San Diego, CA, July 1998.

R. Lladós-Bernaús and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Bidirectional Block Placement in Corrupted Fixed-Length Entropy Coded Video Streams”, *Proceedings of the IEEE Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 391–394, Notre Dame, IN, August 1998.

M. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Reducing the Complexity of Iterative Post-Processing of Video,” *Proceedings of the IEEE Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 399–402, Notre Dame, IN, August 1998.

S. Borman and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Super-Resolution Still from Image Sequences – A Review,” *Proceedings of the IEEE Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pp. 374–378, Notre Dame, IN, August 1998.

Z. Peng, Y. F. Huang, D. Costello, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Joint Decoding for Turbo Codes for Subband Coded Image,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. I:329–333, Chicago, IL, October 1998.

M. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Reducing the Complexity of a MAP Post-Processing Algorithm for Video Sequences,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. I:372–376, Chicago, IL, October 1998.

Z. Peng, Y. F. Huang, D. Costello, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “On the Tradeoff Between Source and Channel Coding Rates for Image Transmission,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. II:118–121, Chicago, IL, October 1998.

R. Lladós-Bernaús and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Computationally Efficient Fixed-Length Entropy Codec for Robust Video Compress,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. III:85–89, Chicago, IL, October 1998.

S. Borman, M. Robertson, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Block-Matching Sub-Pixel Motion Estimation from Noisy Under-Sampled Frames – An Empirical Performance Evaluation,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Communication and Image Processing '99*, Vol. 3653, pp. 1442–1451, January 25–27, 1999.

M. A. Robertson, S. Borman, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Dynamic Range Improvement Through Multiple Exposures,” *Proceedings of the In-*

ternational Conference on Image Processing, pp. III:159–163, Kobe, Japan, October 1999.

S. Borman and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Simultaneous Multi-frame MAP Super-Resolution Video Enhancement using Spatio-temporal Priors”, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. III:469–473, Kobe, Japan, October 1999.

M. A. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Restoration of Compressed Video using Temporal Information,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Visual Communications and Image Processing 2001*, pp. 21–29, San Jose, CA, January 2001.

M. A. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Temporal Resolution Enhancement in Compressed Video,” *Nonlinear Signal and Image Processing 2001*, Baltimore, MD, June 2001.

M. A. Robertson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “DCT Quantization Noise in Compressed Images,” *Proceedings of the International Conference on Image Processing 2001*, Thessaloniki, Greece, pp. 185–188, October, 2001.

K. Erickson and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Frame Type Selection for Off-Line MPEG Encoding,” *Proceedings of SPIE/IS&T Visual Communications and Image Processing 2001*, San Jose, CA, pp. 406–414, January 2002.

D. P. Bennett, J. Bally, I. Bond, E. Cheng, K. Cook, D. Deming, P. Garnavich, K. Griest, D. Jewitt, N. Kaiser, T. R. Lauer, J. Lunine, G. Luppino, J. C. Mather, D. Minniti, S. J. Peale, S. H. Rhie, J. Rhodes, J. Schneider, G. Sonneborn, **R. Stevenson**, C. Stubbs, D. Tenerelli, N. Woolf, and P. Yock, “The Galactic Exoplanet Survey Telescope (GEST)”, *Proceedings of the SPIE International Conference on Future EUV/UV and Visible Space Astrophysics Missions and Instrumentation*, pp. 141–155, Waikoloa, HI, August 2002.

R. Magill, C. E. Rohrs, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Revisiting Output Queued Switch Emulation by a Combined Input/Output Queued Switch,” *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, Allerton, IL, October 2 – 4, 2002.

R. Magill, C. E. Rohrs, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Output Queued Switch

Emulation by a Buffered Crossbar Fabric,” *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, Allerton, IL, October 2 – 4, 2002.

S. Borman and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Image resampling and constraint formulation for multi-frame super-resolution restoration,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Computational Imaging II*, Santa Clara, CA, pp. 234–245, January 20 – 24, 2003.

G. Zhang and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Modified Fixed-Length Entropy Coding Algorithm for Robust Video Compression,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Communications and Processing 2003*, Santa Clara, CA, pp. 470–478, January 20 – 24, 2003.

S. Borman and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Linear models for multi-frame super-resolution restoration under non-affine registration and spatially varying PSF,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Computational Imaging*, San Jose, CA, January 18 – 22, 2004.

G. Zhang, and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Efficient Error Recovery for Multiple Description Video Coding,” *Proceedings of the International Conference on Image Processing 2004*, Singapore, pp. 829–832, October, 2004.

G. Zhang and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Error Resilient Video Coding Using Virtual Reference Picture,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image and Video Communications and Processing 2005*, San Jose, CA, pp. 896–903, January 18–20, 2005.

G. Zhang, **R. L. Stevenson**, “Hybrid Scalable Video Coding with Multiple Description and Layered Coding,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing 2006*, San Jose, CA, January 2006.

Y. Li, **R. L. Stevenson**, J. Gai, “Detection of Junction in Images,” *Proceeding of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Image Processing: Algorithms and Systems V*, San Jose, CA, February 2007.

Y. Li, **R. L. Stevenson**, “Multimodal Image Registration Based on Edges and Junctions,” *Proceeding of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing 2007*, San Jose, CA, January 2007.

J. Gai and **R. L. Stevenson**, "A Robustified Hidden Markov Model for Visual Tracking with Subspace Representation," *Proceeding of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing 2007*, San Jose, CA, January 2007.

Y. , **R. L. Stevenson**, and J. Gai "Corner-Guided Image Registration by using Edges," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Image Processing 2007*, San Antonio, TX, pp. V:361-364, September, 2007.

J. Gai, Y. Li, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Coupled Hidden Markov Models for Robust EO/IR Target Tracking," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Image Processing 2007*, San Antonio, TX, pp. I:41-44, September, 2007.

Y. Li, **R. L. Stevenson**, and J. Gai , "Line segment based image registration," *Proceeding of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing 2008*, San Jose, CA, January 2008.

J. Gai, Y. Li, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Robust Bayesian PCA with Students t-distribution: The variational inference approach," *Proceedings of 15th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. 1340 - 1343, San Diego, CA, October 2008.

J. Gai, Y. Li, and **R. L. Stevenson**, "An EM algorithm for robust Bayesian PCA with students t-distribution," *Proceedings of 15th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. 2672 - 2675, San Diego, CA, October 2008.

Y. Li, **R. L. Stevenson**, and J. Gai , "Curve matching in the framework of Riemannian geometry," *Proceeding of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing 2009*, San Jose, CA, January 2009.

J. Gai and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Contour Tracking BASd On A Synergistic Approach of Geodesic Active Contours and Conditional Random Fields," *Proceedings of the 17th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Hong Kong, China, September, 2010.

J. Gai and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Optical Flow Estimation With p-Harmonic Regularization," *Proceedings of the 17th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Hong Kong, China, September, 2010.

Y. Li and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Affine image registration with curve mapping,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication II*, San Francisco, CA, January 2011.

J. D. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Robust Grid Registration for Non-Blind PSF Estimation,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication III*, San Francisco, CA, January 2012.

Y. Li and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Similarity Metric for Multimodal Images Based on Modified Hausdorff Distance,” *Proceedings of the 9th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Video and Signal-Based Surveillance*, Beijing, China, September 2012.

J. D. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Mapping Measurable Qualities of Point-Spread Function Observations to Seidel Aberration Coefficients,” *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Image Processing*, Orlando, FL, September 2012.

Y. Li and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Multimodal Image Registration By Iteratively Searching Keypoint Correspondences,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication IV*, San Francisco, CA, February 21, 2013.

J. D. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, “A Spatially-Varying PSF Model for Seidel Aberrations and Defocus,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication IV*, San Francisco, CA, February 21, 2013.

Y. Li and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Register multimodal images of range information,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication V*, San Francisco, CA, February 17, 2014.

J. D. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Register Multimodal Images of Range Information,” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication V*, San Francisco, CA, February 17, 2014.

R. Zhen and **R. L. Stevenson**, “Joint Deblurring and Demosaicking of Raw Image Data With Motion Blur” *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T*

Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication V, San Francisco, CA, February 17, 2014.

R. Zhen and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Motion Blur Kernel Estimation Using Noisy Inertial Data," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Paris, France, pp. 4602-6, October 27, 2014.

R. Zhen and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Semi-blind Deblurring Images Captured with Electronic Rolling Shutter Mechanism," *Proceedings of the SPIE/IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication VI*, February 2015.

J. D. Simpkins and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Parameterized modeling and estimation of spatially varying optical blur," *Proceedings of SPIE/IS&T Conference on Digital Photography and Mobile Imaging XI*, February 2015.

R. Zhen and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Motion debarring for depth-varying scenes," *IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication VII*, February 2016.

H. Jin, Y. Li, and **R. L. Stevenson**. "Register Multimodal Image of Large Scene Depth Variation with Global Information," *IS&T Conference on Visual Information Processing and Communication VII*, February 2016.

R. Zhen and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Motion Deblurring and Depth Estimation From Multiple Images," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Phoenix, Arizona, , September 25-29, 2016.

L. N. Kloepper, Y. Fu, M. Kinniry, **R. L. Stevenson**, C. H. Brighton, P. Domski, C. Harding, and G. K. Taylor, "Hawks, ziplines, and drones: new methods for recording echolocation of bats in large groups," *North American Society for Bat Research*, Knoxville, TN, October 2017.

L. N. Kloepper, Y. Fu, M. Kinniry, **R. L. Stevenson**, C. H. Brighton, P. Domski, C. Harding, and G. K. Taylor, "Sensing in streams and swarms: echolocation of bats in large groups," *XXVI International Bioacoustics Council Meeting*, Hardiwar, India, October 2017.

S. Zhang and **R. L. Stevenson**, "Intertia Sensor Aided Alignment for

Burst Pipeline in Low Light Conditions,” *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Athens, Greece, , October 7-10, 2018.

S. Zhang and **R. L. Stevenson**, “GAN Based Image Deblurring Using Dark Channel Prior,” *IS&T Conference on Computational Imaging XVII*, January 2019.

Patents

“Video Coding using a Maximum A Posteriori Loop Filter,” U.S. Patent 6,081,552, June 27, 2000.

Invited Talks

“Bayesian Techniques for Image Restoration,” Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, March 27, 1992.

“Reconstruction and Enhancement of Image and Video Data,” Hewlett Packard Research Laboratory, Palo Alto, CA, October 12, 1993.

“Stochastic Image Modeling for Image Enhancement,” Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA, February 10, 1994.

“Stochastic Image Modeling for Image Enhancement,” Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Northwestern University, IL, May 31, 1994.

“Bayesian Estimation Techniques for Image/Video Processing,” Intel Corp., Hillsboro, OR, Part I July 7, 1994, Part II July 21, 1994.

“HVS Based Image Compression,” Intel Corp., Hillsboro, OR, August 18, 1994.

“Bayesian Estimation Techniques for Image/Video Processing,” Tektronix Inc., Beaverton, OR, August 19, 1994.

“Bayesian Estimation Techniques for Image/Video Processing,” Intel Corp., Santa Clara, CA, August 23, 1994.

“Post-Processing MRV Video Data,” Intel Corp., Hillsboro, OR, August 25, 1994.

“Improved Robust Image/Video Communication,” Motorola Corp., Schaumburg, IL, February 21, 1995.

“Stochastic Modeling of Color Image Data,” Xerox Corp., Webster, NY, May 24, 1995.

“Multi-Frame Integration for Video Enhancement,” Kodak Corp., Rochester, NY, August 4, 1995.

“Bayesian Estimation Techniques for Image/Video Processing,” Ricoh California Research Center, Palo Alto, CA, February 3, 1996.

“Bayesian Estimation Techniques for Image/Video Processing,” University of Delaware, Newark, DE, October 10, 1996.

“Issues in Video Compression,” Intel Corporation, Hillsboro, OR, June 21, 1997.

“Techniques for High-Speed Image Enhancement,” Sun Microsystems, Sunnyvale, CA, May 21, 1998.

“Stochastic Modeling for Image/Video Processing,” Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, Nov. 12, 1998.

“High Performance Multimedia Applications Reserach,” Sun Microsystems, Sunnyvale, CA, Jan. 25, 1999.

“Video over the Internet,” D. E. Shaw & Co., New York, NY, May 4, 2000.

“Entertainment Video over the Internet,” Sun Microsystems, Sunnyvale, CA, Nov. 16, 2000.

“The Creative Scientist,” Keynote address at 16th Annual Undergraduate Research Symposium, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, May 5, 2001.

“Super-Resolution Camera Systems,” Thomson Consumer Electronics, Indianapolis, IN, November 28, 2001.

“Three-Dimensional Signal Processing,” Air Force Research Laboratory, Rome, New York, September 26, 2002.

“Bayesian Image and Video Restoration,” ECE Distinguished Speaker Seminar Series at the Illinois Institute of Technology, October 24, 2003.

“Error Resilient Video Coding,” Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, May 17, 2005.

“Robust Video Compression Using Multiple Description Coding,” Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN, November 2, 2006.

“Bayesian-Based Image and Video Enhancement,” Digimarc Corporation, Beaverton, OR, July 27, 2011.

Dissertations/Theses Supervised

Ph.D. Dissertations

R. R. Schultz, “Multichannel Stochastic Image Models: Theory, Applications, and Implementations,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, November 1994.

T. P. O’Rourke, “Robust Image Communication: An Improved Design,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, January 1996.

B. E. Schmitz, “Enhancement of Sub-Sampled Color Image Data,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, March 1996.

R. Lladós-Bernaus, “Entropy Coding Techniques for Robust Video Compression,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, March 1998.

M. A. Robertson, “High-Quality Reconstruction of Digital Image and Video from Imperfect Observations,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, April 2001.

R. Magill, “Emulating an Output Queued Packet Switch with Systems Containing Input and Output Queueing,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, May 2003.

K. Erickson, “Quality Optimization of Standards - Compliant Encoded Video,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, May 2003.

S. Borman, “Topics in Multiframe Superresolution Restoration,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, May 2004.

G. Zhang, “Robust Scalable Video Compression Using Multiple Description Coding,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, May 2007.

J. Gai, “Robust Target Tracking: Theory, Applications and Implementations,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, May 2010.

Y. Li, “Multimodal Image Registration Through Iteratively Searching

Correspondences of Keypoints and Line Segments,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, December 2012.

J. Simpkins, “Modeling, Approximation, and Estimation of Spatially-Varying Blur in Photographic Systems,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, May 2016.

L. Hollmann, “Modeling, Approximation, and Estimation of Spatially-Varying Blur in Photographic Systems,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, November 2016.

R. Zhen, “Aided Blind Deblurring Image Degraded by Motion Blur,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, February 2017.

M.S.E.E. Theses

R. R. Schultz, “Improved Definition Image Expansion,” M.S.E.E. Thesis, University of Notre Dame, January 1992.

T. P. O’Rourke, “Human Visual Based Wavelet Decomposition for Image Compression,” M.S.E.E. Thesis, University of Notre Dame, December 1992.

B. E. Schmitz, “Curve Reconstruction: A Balance Between Smoothness and Discontinuity Preservation,” M.S.E.E. Thesis, University of Notre Dame, February 1993.

H. M. Zayed, “A Tunable Analog VLSI Network for Preserving Discontinuities in One-Dimensional Signals,” M.S.E.E Thesis, University of Notre Dame, November 1993 (co-adviser: G. Bernstein).

M. J. Wahoske, “Dual-Receiver Blind Identification for Image Blurs,” M.S.E.E Thesis, University of Notre Dame, August 1996 (co-adviser: R. Liu).

M. Robertson, “Computationally Efficient Post-Processing of Compressed Video Streams,” M.S.E.E Thesis, University of Notre Dame, February 1998.

G. Zhang, “Modified Fixed-Length Entropy Coding for Robust Video Compression,” M.S.E.E Thesis, University of Notre Dame, December 2002.

J. D. Simpkins, “Modeling and Estimation of Spatially-Varying Point-Spread Functions Due to Lens Aberrations and Defocus,” M.S.E.E. Thesis, University of Notre Dame, December 2011.

R. Zhen, “Enhanced Raw Image Capture and Deblurring,” M.S.E.E. Thesis, University of Notre Dame, May 2013.

Current Research Students

Shuang Zhang
Jieyu Li
Mohammad Rasool Izadi

Research Funding

Current Funding

Principal Investigator, Office of Naval Research, \$54,073 for “Signal Processing Methods to Isolate Individual Bat FM calls from within the noise of a swarm.”

Principal Investigator, EE Chair Fund, \$500,000 for “Video Enhancement Research.”

Prior Funding

Principal Investigator, Jesse H. Jones Faculty Research Fund, University of Notre Dame, \$9,750 for “Reliable Surface Parameter Estimation in Three-Dimensional Vision,” (with P. Flynn).

Principal Investigator, Jesse H. Jones Faculty Research Equipment Fund, University of Notre Dame, \$7,675 for “Hardware for the Acquisition and Display of Real-Time Video Signals,” (with K. Sauer).

Co-Principal Investigator, Rome Laboratory, F30602-92-C-0138, \$85,000 for “Multi-Frame Integration,” (with Y. Huang and R. Liu).

Co-Principal Investigator, National Science Foundation, CDA92-22905, \$58,126 for a “High Resolution Video Processing System,” (with D. Costello, K. Sauer, P. Bauer, Y. Huang and R. Liu).

Principal Investigator, Indiana Space Grant Consortium, \$7,300 for

“Real-Time Vision for Teleoperated Control of Unmanned Vehicles and Robots,” \$7,500 for “Robust Video Coding,” \$5,889 for “Robust Video Coding,”

Principal Investigator, Apple Computer, Inc., \$15,000 for “Color Palette Restoration,” \$16,467 equipment donation.

Co-Principal Investigator, Office of University Computing, University of Notre Dame, \$20,000 for “Computing for System Engineering,” (with D. Costello and A. Lumsdaine).

Co-Principal Investigator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA-NAG 3-1549, \$50,795 for “Integrated System Design for the Transmission of Image Data over Low Bit Rate Noisy Channels,” (with D. Costello and Y. Huang).

Principal Investigator, Rome Laboratory, F30602-94-1-0017, \$35,408 for “Multi-Frame Integration for the Extraction of High Resolution Still Images from Video Sequences.”

Principal Investigator, Rome Laboratory, F30602-94-1-0016, \$50,785 for “Parallel and Distributed Algorithms for High-Speed Image Processing,” (with A. Lumsdaine).

Principal Investigator, Intel Corp., \$68,000 for “Post-Processing Compressed Video Data,” \$15,000 equipment donation.

Co-Principal Investigator, Lockheed Martin, \$150,000 for “Robust Transmission of Images over Noisy Channels,” (with D. Costello and Y. Huang).

Principal Investigator, Apple Computer, Inc., \$19,100 for “Quicktake Image Enhancement,” \$15,000 equipment donation.

Co-Principal Investigator, Office of University Computing, University of Notre Dame, \$21,600 for “Multidisciplinary Engineering Design Laboratory,” (with J. Brockman, J. Kantor, J. Renaud, D. Kirkner, S. Batill, and P. Kogge).

Principal Investigator, Motorola Corp., \$91,252 for “Robust Transmission of Image Data over Low-Bit-Rate Noisy Channels,” (with D. Costello, R. Liu and Y. Huang).

Principal Investigator, Rome Laboratory, F30602-96-C-0235, \$199,964 for “Parallel and Distributed Algorithms for High-Speed Image Processing,” (with A. Lumsdaine).

Co-Principal Investigator, Office of University Computing, University of Notre Dame, \$23,000 for “An ATM Network for High-Speed Communications,” (with A. Lumsdaine).

Principal Investigator, Sun Microsystems, \$21,400 for “VIS-Based Image Enhancement.”

Co-Principal Investigator, IBM, \$309,544 for “Scalable Shared Memory: Case Studies,” (with A. Lumsdaine, N. Chrisochoides, J. Westerink, E. Maginn, M. Stadtherr).

Co-Principal Investigator, Army Research Office, DAAG55-98-1-0091, \$250,000 for “Scalable Meta-Computing for Computational Science and Engineering,” with A. Lumsdaine, N. Chrisochoides, J. Westerink, E. Maginn, M. Stadtherr).

Principal Investigator, Graduate School, University of Notre Dame, \$71,980 for “High-Resolution Video Processing,”.

Principal Investigator, Department of Defense, MDA904-98-C-B224, \$124,150 for “Temporal Image Enhancement,” (with A. Lumsdaine).

Co-Principal Investigator, Graduate School, University of Notre Dame, \$215,000 for “Scalable Meta-Computing for High Performance Computational Science and Engineering,” (with A. Lumsdaine, N. Chrisochoides, J. Westerink, E. Maginn, M. Stadtherr).

Principal Investigator, Sun Microsystems, \$55,060 for “Multimedia Architectures.”

Principal Investigator, Graduate School, University of Notre Dame, \$75,000 for “Sun Microsystems Embedded Center.”

Co-Principal Investigator, Indiana’s 21st Century Research & Technology Fund, \$829,714 for “Entertainment Video over the Internet,” (with E. Delp, B. Beyers, C. Rosenberg, P. Salama, and N. Shroff).

Principal Investigator, Sun Microsystems, \$40,000 for “Entertainment Video.”

Co-Principal Investigator, National Science Foundation, \$248,887 for “Instrumentation for Multidimensional Imaging and Applications”, (P. Flynn, K. Bowyer, and D.Z. Chen).

Principal Investigator, Department of the Air Force, \$75,000 for “Multi-Source Image Correlation and Analysis,” (with P. Flynn, and K. Bowyer).

Co-Principal Investigator, Indiana’s 21st Century Research & Technology Fund, \$856,576 for “Advanced Digital Video Compression: New Techniques for Security Applications,” (with E. Delp, L. Christopher, B. Brenner, C. Armstrong, and P. Salama).

Principal Investigator, Office of Naval Research, \$39,461 for “Biologically Inspired Approaches to Overcome Mutual-Interference by Active Sensor Systems.”

Teaching and Course Development

EE220	Devices and Systems in Electrical Engineering Developed: Fall 1998 Taught: Fall 1998, 1999, 2000
EE224/EE20224	Introduction to Electrical Engineering Taught: Fall 1990, 1992, 1995, 1999, 2000, 2006, 2007, 2008
EE242/EE20242	Electronic Circuits Taught: Spring 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005
EE30363	Random Phenomena in Electrical Engineering Taught: Spring 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013
EE30321	Embedded Systems Developed: Spring 2016 Taught: Spring 2016, 2017, 2018
EE40354	Multimedia Signals and Systems Developed: Fall 2012 Taught: Fall 2012, 2016, 2017; Spring 2014
EE471/EE40471	Digital Signal Processing Taught: Spring 1992, 1993, 1995, 1996, 2000, 2008
EG498	Multidisciplinary Engineering Design Laboratory

	Developed: Fall 1995 Taught: Fall 1995
EE498	Topics in Image Processing Taught: Fall 1994
EE573/EE60573	Random Processing, Estimation and Detection Theory Taught: Spring 2007, 2009
EE581/EE60581	Digital Image Processing Taught: Spring 1991, 1994, 1999, 2006, 2015; Fall 1997, 2001, 2003, 2010
EE598/EE60671	Advanced Digital Signal Processing Developed: Fall 2004 Taught: Fall 2004, 2005, 2011, 2013, 2014
EE598	Computer Vision Developed: Fall 1991 Taught: Fall 1991, 1993
EE663/EE80663	Advanced Stochastic Processes Developed: Spring 1998 Taught: Spring 1998, Fall 2002, 2009
ELEG631	Applications of Digital Signal Processing Developed: Fall 1996 Taught: Fall 1996, University of Delaware
CSE498P	Digital Multimedia Hub System Design Developed: Spring 2003 Taught: Spring 2003

University Services

University

- Committee on Advising
2018–Present
- Chair, Science and Technology Subcommittee of the Core Curriculum
Committee
2018–Present
- Core Curriculum Committee
2018–Present
- Club Supervisor, Notre Dame Machine Learning Club
2018–Present

Club Supervisor, Rubik's Cube Club of Notre Dame
2011–2015

University Committee on Research and Sponsored Programs
2006–2010

Intellectual Property Committee
2003–2006

ND's Technical Liaison to the Indiana Governor for Sun Microsystems
2000–2001

Committee on Technical Computing
1995–1996

University Committee on Computer and Information Sciences
1995–1996, 2002–2003

University Committee on Academic Technology
2003–2006

Faculty Senate
1993–1996

Freshman Orientation
1993–1995, 1998–2007

Engineering College

Ad-hoc Committee on First Year Engineering
2018–Present

Four Horsemen Venture Capital Fund Advisory Committee
2003–2004

CSE Chairman Search Committee
1999–2001

College Council
1997–2000

Undergraduate Studies Committee
1994–1996, 1998–1999, 2013–Present

College Computer Committee
1995–1996, 1997–2013

Ad hoc College Computer Committee
2001–2002, 2007

Friends of the MEP mentoring initiative
1992

Electrical Engineering Department

Ad-hoc Committee on the Curriculum
2017–Present

Director of Undergraduate Studies
2014–Present

ABET Coordinator
2016–2017
Committee on Appointments and Promotions
2007–2009, 2017–Present
Area Committee Chairman
2002–2013
Graduate Committee
1991–1994, 2003–2005, 2006–2008, 2010–2012
Undergraduate Committee
1994–1996, 1998–2000, 2001–2003, 2005–2007, 2011–Present
Undergraduate Coordinator
1994–1996, 1998–1999
Undergraduate Mentor
2006–2014
Qualifying Exam Coordinator
1991–1993
Computer Committee, Chair
1994–1996, 1997–2013
Electrical Engineering Commencement Coordinator
2002
Graduate Admissions Committee
1997–1998, 2008, 2013
Facilities Committee
1997–1998
Honesty Committee
1993–1994
Eta Kappa Nu Faculty Advisor
1991–1996

February 8, 2019

Robert Louis Stevenson

Litigation Experience

Contact 1961 Camp Madron Rd., Lot 38
 Buchanan, MI 49107

 Tel.: +1 574-339-3514
 EMail: rlstevenson@me.com

Expert Testimony (last 6 years)

Expert witness for Oracle Corporation et al., AT&T, Inc., et al., and eHarmony, Inc. in “Click-to-Call Technologies LP v. Oracle Corporation et al.,” “Click-to-Call Technologies LP v. AT&T, Inc., et al.,” and “Click-to-Call Technologies LP v. eHarmony, Inc.” Civil Action Nos. 1:12-cv-00465; 1:12-cv-00468; 1:12-cv-00466 in the Western District of Texas (Markman hearing testimony).

Expert witness for Flashpoint Technology, Inc., in “Certain Electronic Imaging Devices,” ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-850 (deposition and hearing testimony).

Expert witness for Autodesk, Inc. in “American Imaging Services, Inc. v. Autodesk, Inc.,” Civil Action No. 3:09-CV-733-M in the Northern District of Texas Dallas Division (trial testimony).

Expert witness for Adobe Systems, Inc. in “Everyscape, Inc. v. Adobe Systems,” Civil Action No. 10-cv-11597-RGS in the District of Massachusetts Boston Division (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Cochlear Corp. in the case “Cochlear Corp., et al. v. Alfred E. Mann Foundation for Scientific Research,” Civil Action No. CV 07-08108 GHK (CTX) in the Central District of California (deposition and trial testimony).

Expert witness for Macronix in “Creative Integrated Systems, Inc. v. Nintendo of America, Inc. et al.” Civil Action No. CV10-2735 AHM (VBKx) in the Central District of California, Southern Division (deposition and trial testimony).

Expert witness for Corporation in “SDI Technologies, Inc. v. Bose Corporation” Cases IPR2013-00350 and IPR2013-00465 before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Canon Inc. in “Canon Inc v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC.” Cases IPR2014-00631 and IPR2014-00632 before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Canon Inc. in “Intellectual Ventures II LLC. v. Canon Inc.” Case 13-CV-473 (SLR) for the District of Delaware (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for CTP Innovations, LLC in “Eastman Kodak Company, et al. v. CTP Innovations, LLC.” Case IPR2014-00790 before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Google, Inc. in “Videoshare, LLC. v. Google, Inc. et al.” Civil Action No. 13-cv-990 (GMS) in the District of Delaware (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Canon, Inc., in “Technology Properties Limited, LLC et al. v. Canon, Inc. et al,” Case No. 4:14-cv-03640-CW in the Northern District of California, Oakland Division (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Advanced Silicon Technologies, LLC., in “Certain Computing or Graphics Systems, Components Thereof, and Vehicles containing same,” ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-984 (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Alcate-Lucent USA, Inc., in “Intellectual Ventures, et al. v. Toshiba Corporation, et al,” Case No. 1:14-cv-0764-WTL-TAB in the Southern District of Indiana Indianapolis Division (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Nautilus Hyosung, Inc., in “Certain Automated Teller Machines, ATM Products, Components Thereof, and Products Containing the Same,” ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-972 (deposition and hearing testimony).

Expert witness for Toshiba., in “Intellectual Ventures, et al. v. Toshiba Corporation, et al,” Case No. 13-453-SLR-SRF in the District of Delaware (deposition testimony and trial testimony).

Expert witness for Samsung Electronics Co. LTD. and Microsoft Corporation in “Microsoft Corporation, et al. v. FastVDO LLC.” Case IPR2016-01179 before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Samsung., in “Image Processing Technologies, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., LTD, et. al” Case No. 2:16-CV-0505-JRG in the Eastern District of Texas (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Harmonic, Inc., in “Avid Technology, Inc. v. Harmonic, Inc.,” Case No. 17-682-GMS in the District of Delaware (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for IPDEV Co., in “IPDEV Co. v. Ameranth, Inc.,” Case No. 3:14-cv-01303-DMS-WVG in the Southern District of California (deposition testimony).

Expert witness for Funai, MediaTek, MStar, Vizio, LG and Sigma., in “Certain Semiconductor Devices and Consumer Audiovisual Products Containing the Same,” ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-1047 (deposition and trial).

Expert witness for LG Electronics, Inc., in “Mondis Technology LTD. v. LG Electronics, Inc., et al.,” Case No. 15-cv-4431 (SRC)(CLW) in the District of New Jersey (deposition).

Expert witness for Eagle View Technologies, Inc., in “Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et al.,” Case No. 1:15-cv-07025-RBK-JS in the District of New Jersey (deposition).

Expert witness for Apple Inc., in “Qualcomm Inc., v. Apple Inc.,” Case No. 3:17-CV-1375-DMS-MDDD in the Southern District of California (deposition).

Expert witness for Align Technology, Inc., in “Certain Intraoral Scanners and Related Hardware and Software,” ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-1090 (Markman hearing technology tutorial, deposition and hearing testimony).

Expert witness for Apple Inc., in “Qualcomm Inc., v. Apple Inc.,” Case No. 3:17-cv-00108-GPC-MDD and 3:17-cv-00110-GPC-MDD in the Southern District of California (deposition).

Expert witness for ZiiLabs Inc. Ltd., in “Certain Graphics Processors

and Products Containing the Same,” ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-1099
(Markman Hearing Technology Tutorial and deposition).

February 28, 2019

MARCH 2019

Curriculum Vitae

Jonathan I. Arnold, Ph.D.

jonathan.arnold@chicagoecon.com

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. Business Economics, Graduate School of Business, The University of Chicago

M.B.A. Finance and Accounting, The University of Chicago Graduate School of Business

B.A. Economics, The University of Chicago

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE SINCE 1995:

2013 - Testifying Expert Economist, Chicago Economics Corp.

2013 - Senior Consultant, Compass Lexecon.

2012 - 2013 Chief Economist, Office of the Attorney General, New York State

2006 - 2012 Managing Principal, Analysis Group, Inc.

1995 - 2006 Principal, Chicago Partners

TESTIMONY - SINCE 2003:

- Declaration in *Class v. Samsung Telecommunications America*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-582-JD. (January 2019)
- Court Testimony in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (January 2019)
- Expert Report in re Transcare (Debtor) in the matter of *Salvatore Lamonica, as Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estates of TransCare v. Lynn Tilton*, U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of New York, Chapter 7 Case No. 16-10407. (November 2018)
- Rebuttal Expert Report in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (November 2018)
- Expert Report in *U.S.A. v. Matthew Connolly and Gavin Black*, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Case No. 01:16-CR-00370 (CM). (September 2018)
- Deposition in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (August 2018)
- Expert Report in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (July 2018)

- Deposition in *Eagle View Technologies v. Xactware Solutions*, U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 15-cv-07025. (May 2018)
- Expert Report in *State of Washington v. LG Electronics*, Superior Court of King County, Washington, Case No. 12-2-15842-8. (May 2018)
- Rebuttal Expert Report in *Eagle View Technologies v. Xactware Solutions*, U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 15-cv-07025. (May 2018)
- Expert Report in *Eagle View Technologies v. Xactware Solutions*, U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 15-cv-07025. (May 2018)
- Expert Report in *Eagle View Technologies v. Xactware Solutions*, U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 15-cv-07025. (April 2018)
- Testimony In the Matter of Certain Two-Way Radio Equipment and Systems, Related Software and Components Thereof, United States International Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-1053. (January 2018)
- Deposition In the Matter of Certain Two-Way Radio Equipment and Systems, Related Software and Components Thereof, United States International Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-1053. (November 2017)
- Expert Report In the Matter of Certain Two-Way Radio Equipment and Systems, Related Software and Components Thereof, United States International Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-1053. (October 2017)
- Deposition In re Avaya, U.S. Bankruptcy Court of the Southern District of New York, Ch. 11, Case No. 17-10089. (October 2017)
- Expert Report In re Avaya, U.S. Bankruptcy Court of the Southern District of New York, Ch. 11, Case No. 17-10089. (October 2017)
- Deposition in *Stark Master Fund Ltd. and Stark Global Opportunities Master Fund Ltd. v. Credit Suisse Securities*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, No. 14-cv-689. (August 2017)
- Testimony in *The Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico, as representative of The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico* (PROMESA Title III No. 17 BK 3283-LTS); in re: *The Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico, as representative of Puerto Rico Highways & Transportation Authority* (PROMESA Title III, No. 17 BK 3567-LTS); *Peaje Investments v. Puerto Rico Highways & Transportation Authority* (Adv. Proc. No. 17-151-LTS in 17 BK 3567-LTS and Adv. Proc. No. 17-152-LTS in 17 BK 3283-LTS) (August 2017)
- Rebuttal Expert Report in *Stark Master Fund Ltd. and Stark Global Opportunities Master Fund Ltd. V. Credit Suisse Securities*, U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of Wisconsin, No. 14-cv-689. (August 2017)
- Deposition in *The United States of America, ex rel., John H. Oberg v. Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency*, U.S. District court of the Easter District of Virginia, No. 1:07-cv-00960-CMH-JFA. (August 2017)
- Deposition in *The Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico, as representative of The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico* (PROMESA Title III No. 17 BK 3283-LTS); in re: *The*

Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico, as representative of Puerto Rico Highways & Transportation Authority (PROMESA Title III, No. 17 BK 3567-LTS); Peaje Investments v. Puerto Rico Highways & Transportation Authority (Adv. Proc. No. 17-151-LTS in 17 BK 3567-LTS and Adv. Proc. No. 17-152-LTS in 17 BK 3283-LTS) (July 2017)

- Declaration in *The Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico, as representative of The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico* (PROMESA Title III No. 17 BK 3283-LTS); in re: *The Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico, as representative of Puerto Rico Highways & Transportation Authority* (PROMESA Title III, No. 17 BK 3567-LTS); *Peaje Investments v. Puerto Rico Highways & Transportation Authority* (Adv. Proc. No. 17-151-LTS in 17 BK 3567-LTS and Adv. Proc. No. 17-152-LTS in 17 BK 3283-LTS) (July 2017)
- Expert Report in *Stark Master Fund Ltd. and Stark Global Opportunities Master Fund Ltd. V. Credit Suisse Securities*, U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of Wisconsin, No. 14-cv-689. (July 2017)
- Expert Report in *The United States of America, ex rel., John H. Oberg v. Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency*, U.S. District court of the Easter District of Virginia, No. 1:07-cv-00960-CMH-JFA. (June 2017)
- Deposition in *The State of Illinois v. Hitachi*, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 2012-CH-35266. (April 2017)
- Hearing Testimony in *Arista Networks v. Cisco Systems*, International Trade Commission Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-977. (April 2017)
- Deposition in *Arista Networks v. Cisco Systems*, International Trade Commission Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-977. (February 2017)
- Second Supplemental Expert Report in *Arista Networks v. Cisco Systems*, International Trade Commission Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-977. (February 2017)
- Supplemental Expert Report in *Arista Networks v. Cisco Systems*, International Trade Commission Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-977. (February 2017)
- Expert Report in *Arista Networks v. Cisco Systems*, International Trade Commission Washington, D.C., Investigation No. 337-TA-977. (January 2017)
- Rebuttal Expert Report in *The State of Illinois v. Hitachi*, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 2012-CH-35266. (January 2017)
- Court Testimony in a consolidated proceeding comprising *Brigade Leveraged Capital Structures Fund v. Alejandro Garcia-Padilla* (16-1610), *National Public Finance Guarantee v. Alejandro Garcia-Padilla* (16-2101), *Dionisio Trigo-Gonzalez v. Alejandro Garcia-Padilla* (16-2257), and *U.S. Bank Trust National Association v. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico* (16-2510), U.S. District Court, District of Puerto Rico. (September 2016)
- Deposition in *MyFord Touch Consumer Litigation*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. 13-cv-3072-EMC. (September 2016)
- Responsive Damages Expert Report in *MyFord Touch Consumer Litigation*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. 13-cv-3072-EMC. (September 2016)

- Expert Report in *The State of Illinois v. Hitachi*, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 2012-CH-35266. (August 2016)
- Deposition in *Philips v. Ford*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, Case No. 5:14-cv-02989-LHK. (August 2016)
- Trial Testimony in *Nortek Air Solutions v. Energy Labs*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, Case No. 5:14-cv-02919-BLF. (August 2016)
- Damages Expert Report in *MyFord Touch Consumer Litigation*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. 13-cv-3072-EMC. (August 2016)
- Expert Report in *Philips v. Ford*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, Case No. 5:14-cv-02989-LHK. (July 2016)
- Responsive Expert Report in *MyFord Touch Consumer Litigation*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. 13-cv-3072-EMC. (May 2016)
- Supplemental Declaration *Lena K. Thodos and David Miller v. Nicor*, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 11CH06556. (April 2016)
- Deposition in *Nortek Air Solutions v. Energy Labs*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, Case No. 5:14-cv-02919-BLF (March 2016)
- Expert Report in *Nortek Air Solutions v. Energy Labs*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, Case No. 5:14-cv-02919-BLF (February 2016)
- Deposition in *MyFord Touch Consumer Litigation*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. 13-cv-3072-EMC. (February 2016)
- Deposition in *Richard S. Stack, M.D. v. Abbott Laboratories*, U.S. District Court, Middle District of North Carolina, Case No. 1:12-CV-148. (January 2016)
- Expert Report in *MyFord Touch Consumer Litigation*, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. 13-cv-3072-EMC. (January 2016)
- Deposition in *Lena K. Thodos and David Miller v. Nicor*, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 11CH06556. (December 2015)
- Expert Report in *Richard S. Stack, M.D. v. Abbott Laboratories*, U.S. District Court, Middle District of North Carolina, Case No. 1:12-CV-148. (December 2015)
- Declaration in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-CV-05567. (November 2015)
- Declaration in *Lena K. Thodos and David Miller v. Nicor*, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 11CH06556. (October 2015)
- Deposition in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (October 2015)
- Supplemental Expert Report in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-cv-05567. (September 2015)

- Deposition in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-cv-05567. (August 2015)
- Rebuttal Expert Report in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-cv-05567. (June 2015)
- Expert Report in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-cv-05567. (May 2015)
- Expert Report in *Thomas & Betts International v. Burny*, U.S. District Court, Western District of Tennessee, Case No. 2:14-cv-2296-JPM-tmp. (April 2015)
- Testimony in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (March 2015)
- Supplemental Expert Report in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court,
- Deposition in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-cv-05567. (August 2015)
- Rebuttal Expert Report in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-cv-05567. (June 2015)
- Expert Report in *Russell Dover v. British Airways*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 1:12-cv-05567. (May 2015)
- Expert Report in *Thomas & Betts International v. Burny*, U.S. District Court, Western District of Tennessee, Case No. 2:14-cv-2296-JPM-tmp. (April 2015)
- Testimony in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (March 2015)
- Deposition in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (February 2015)
- Deposition in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (January 2015)
- Expert Report in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (January 2015)
- Reply Declaration in *Cryolife, Inc. v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, U. S. District Court of the District of Delaware, Case No. CV-14-00559-SLR. (January 2015)
- Declaration in *Cryolife, Inc. v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, U. S. District Court of the District of Delaware, Case No. CV-14-00559-SLR. (September 2014)
- Expert Report in *Illinois Pension Litigation*, Circuit Court for the Seventh Judicial Circuit, Sangamon County Illinois, Case No. 2014-MR1. (August 2014)
- Deposition in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity, et al.*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (August 2014)
- Expert Report in *Jo Ann Howard and Associates v. J. Douglas Cassity, et al.*, U.S. District Court Eastern District of Missouri, Case No. 09-CV-1252-ERW. (July 2014)

- Testimony in SolidFX, LLC v. Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Colorado, Case No. 11-CV-1468. (April 2014)
- Supplemental Expert Report in SolidFX, LLC v. Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Colorado, Case No. 11-CV-1468. (April 2014)
- Deposition in Noble Systems Corporation v. TRG Holdings LLC, JAMS, Case No. 1440003731. (April 2014)
- Expert Report in Noble Systems Corporation v. TRG Holdings LLC, JAMS, Case No. 1440003731. (March 2014)
- Affidavit in Lena K Thodos and David Miller, et al v. Nicor, Inc. Northern Illinois Gas Company, U.S. Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois County Department, Chancery Division, Case No. 11CH06556. (February 2014)
- Testimony in C. Geoffrey Hampson, Christopher Hampson, and Hampson Equities, Ltd., v. Live Current Media, Inc. and David Jeffs, JAMS, Case No. 1260002566. (October 2013)
- Deposition in C. Geoffrey Hampson, Christopher Hampson, and Hampson Equities, Ltd., v. Live Current Media, Inc. and David Jeffs, JAMS, Case No. 1260002566. (October 2013)
- Expert Report in C. Geoffrey Hampson, Christopher Hampson, and Hampson Equities, Ltd., v. Live Current Media, Inc. and David Jeffs, JAMS, Case No. 1260002566. (September 2013)
- Testimony in AM General, LLC v. BAE Systems, Inc., et al., St. Joseph Superior Court, State of Indiana County of St. Joseph, Case No. 71D07-0907-PL-00195. (October 2012)
- Deposition in SolidFX, LLC v. Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Colorado, Case No. 11-CV-1468. (February 2012)
- Deposition in St. Joseph Superior Court, State of Indiana County of St. Joseph, Case No. 71D07-0907-PL-00195. (May 2012)
- Supplemental Expert Report in AM General, LLC v. BAE Systems, Inc., et al., St. Joseph Superior Court, State of Indiana County of St. Joseph, Case No. 71D07-0907-PL-00195. (April 2012)
- Rebuttal Expert Report in AM General, LLC v. BAE Systems, Inc., et al., St. Joseph Superior Court, State of Indiana County of St. Joseph, Case No. 71D07-0907-PL-00195. (April 2012)
- Expert Report in AM General, LLC v. BAE Systems, Inc., et al., St. Joseph Superior Court, State of Indiana County of St. Joseph, Case No. 71D07-0907-PL-00195. (March 2012)
- Expert report in SolidFX, LLC v. Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Colorado, Case No. 11-CV-1468. (February 2012)
- Deposition in Edgenet, Inc. v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., and James Musial, State of Wisconsin, Circuit Court, Waukesha County, Case No. 10-CV-10910. (December 2011)
- Expert report in Edgenet, Inc. v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., and James Musial, State of Wisconsin, Circuit Court, Waukesha County, Case No. 10-CV-10910. (October 2011)
- Testimony in BGCantor Market Data, L.P. v. Tullett Prebon Americas Corp., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 50-148-T-00737-10. (September 2011)

- Deposition in BGCantor Market Data, L.P. v. Tullett Prebon Americas Corp., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 50-148-T-00737-10. (July 2011)
- Second Supplemental Expert report in BGCantor Market Data, L.P. v. Tullett Prebon Americas Corp., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 50-148-T-00737-10. (July 2011)
- Supplemental Expert report in BGCantor Market Data, L.P. v. Tullett Prebon Americas Corp., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 50-148-T-00737-10. (July 2011)
- Expert report in MBDA UK Limited v. Raytheon Company, American Arbitration Association, Case No. 50-180-T-00462-04. (June 2011)
- Expert report in BGCantor Market Data, L.P. v. Tullett Prebon Americas Corp., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 50-148-T-00737-10. (June 2011)
- Testimony in Agility Defense & Government Services, Inc. v. DynCorp International, LLC, American Arbitration Association, Case No. 13-132-00990-10. (April 2011)
- Deposition in Agility Defense & Government Services, Inc. v. DynCorp International, LLC, American Arbitration Association, Case No. 13-132-00990-10. (March 2011)
- Testimony in Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. v. Matthew B. Hinerfeld, American Arbitration Association, Case No. 51 116972 09. (February 2011)
- Deposition in Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. v. Matthew B. Hinerfeld, American Arbitration Association, Case No. 51 116972 09. (February 2011)
- Expert report in Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. v. Matthew B. Hinerfeld, American Arbitration Association, Case No. 51 116972 09. (February 2011)
- Expert report in Agility Defense & Government Services, Inc. v. DynCorp International, LLC, American Arbitration Association, Case No. 13-132-00990-10. (December 2010)
- Arbitration testimony in ADA-ES, Inc., et al. v. Norit Americas, Inc., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 13-132- Y 00718 09. (October 2010)
- Deposition in ADA-ES, Inc., et al. v. Norit Americas, Inc., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 30 192 Y 00718 09. (July 2010)
- Expert report in ADA-ES, Inc., et al. v. Norit Americas, Inc., American Arbitration Association, Case No. 30 192 Y 00718 09. (July 2010)
- Deposition in Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. et al. v. Mikhail Malyshev and Jace and CIG GP, L.L.C., American Arbitration Association, Case No. AAA 51 166 00969 09 and Case No. AAA 51 166 00970 09. (June 2010)
- Expert report in Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. et al. v. Mikhail Malyshev and Jace Kohlmeier and Mikhail Malyshev and Jace Kohlmeier v. Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. and CIG GP, L.L.C., American Arbitration Association, Case No. AAA 51 166 00969 09 and Case No. AAA 51 166 00970 09. (June 2010)
- Expert report in Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. et al. v. Mikhail Malyshev and Jace Kohlmeier and Mikhail Malyshev and Jace Kohlmeier v. Citadel Investment Group, L.L.C. and CIG GP, L.L.C., American Arbitration Association, Case No. AAA 51 166 00969 09 and Case No. AAA 51 166 00970 09. (June 2010)

- Deposition in Marc S. Kirschner v. Thomas H. Lee Partners L.P., et al. , U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Case No. 07 CIV 7074. (June 2010)
- Expert report in Marc S. Kirschner v. Thomas H. Lee Partners L.P., et al., U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Case No. 07 CIV 7074. (April 2010)
- Court testimony in Federal Trade Commission v. Lundbeck Inc. and State of Minnesota v. Lundbeck Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota, Case No. 08-CV-6379 (JNE/JJG) and Case No. 08-CV-6381 (JNE/JJG). (December 2009)
- Deposition in Encore Capital Group, Inc., et al.v. Jefferson Capital Systems, Inc., American Arbitration Association, Case No. AAA 13-148-Y-01611-08 and Case No. AAA #73-148-Y 32920-08. (August 2009)
- Supplemental expert report in Encore Capital Group, Inc., et al.v. Jefferson Capital Systems, Inc., American Arbitration Association, Case No. AAA 13-148-Y-01611-08 and Case No. AAA 73-148-Y-32920-08. (August 2009)
- Deposition in Federal Trade Commission v. Lundbeck Inc. and State of Minnesota v. Lundbeck Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota, Case No. 08-CV-6379 (JNE/JJG) and Case No. 08-CV-6381 (JNE/JJG). (August 2009)
- Expert report in CompuCredit Corporation v. Columbus Bank and Trust Company, Superior Court of Fulton County, State of Georgia, Case No. 2008-CV-157010. (August 2009)
- Expert report in Encore Capital Group, Inc., et al.v. Jefferson Capital Systems, Inc., American Arbitration Association, Case No. AAA 13-148-Y-01611-08 and Case No. AAA 73-148-Y-32920-08. (July 2009)
- Supplemental expert report in Federal Trade Commission v. Lundbeck Inc. and State of Minnesota v. Lundbeck Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota, Case No. 08-CV-6379 (JNE/JJG) and Case No. 08-CV-6381 (JNE/JJG). (July 2009)
- Supplement to expert report in Federal Trade Commission v. Lundbeck Inc. and State of Minnesota v. Lundbeck Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota, Case No. 08-CV-6379 (JNE/JJG) and Case No. 08-CV-6381 (JNE/JJG). (June 2009)
- Rebuttal expert report in Hawaii Structural Ironworkers Pension Trust Fund v. Calpine Corporation, Superior Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. 1-04-CV-021465. (May 2009)
- Expert report in Federal Trade Commission v. Lundbeck Inc. and State of Minnesota v. Lundbeck Inc., U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota, Case No. 08-CV-6379 (JNE/JJG) and Case No. 08-CV-6381 (JNE/JJG). (April 2009)
- Expert report in Hawaii Structural Ironworkers Pension Trust Fund v. Calpine Corporation, Superior Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. 1-04-CV-021465. (April 2009)
- Expert report in the arbitration between BASF Corporation v. POSM II Properties Partnership LP, American Arbitration Association, Arbitration No. 70-198-Y-00547-07 (May 2008)

- Deposition in General Electric Company v. BASF Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Civil Action No. 06 CV 0283. (April 2008)
- Rebuttal expert report in General Electric Company v. BASF Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Civil Action No. 06 CV 0283. (December 2007)
- Expert report in General Electric Company v. BASF Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Civil Action No. 06 CV 0283. (December 2007)
- Court testimony in BASF Corporation v. Lyondell Chemical Company, Superior Court of Morris County, New Jersey (Law Division), Civil Action No. L-001069-05. (July 2007)
- Deposition in BASF Corporation v. Lyondell Chemical Company, Superior Court of Morris County, New Jersey (Law Division), Civil Action No. L-001069-05. (June 2007)
- Rebuttal expert report in Parmalat Securities Litigation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Master Docket No. 04 MD 1653 (LAK). (June 2007)
- Affidavit in BASF Corporation v. Lyondell Chemical Company, Superior Court of Morris County, New Jersey (Law Division), Docket No. MRS-L-001069-05. (June 2007)
- Expert report in re Parmalat Securities Litigation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Master Docket No. 04 MD 1653 (LAK) (and related to 04 Civ. 0030 (LAK)). (May 2007)
- Affidavit in BASF Corporation v. Lyondell Chemical Company, Superior Court of Morris County, New Jersey (Law Division), Civil Action No. L-001069-05. (April 2007)
- Deposition in BASF Corporation v. Lyondell Chemical Company, Superior Court of Morris County, New Jersey (Law Division), Civil Action No. L-001069-05. (March 2007)
- Rebuttal expert report in BASF Corporation v. Lyondell Chemical Company, Superior Court of Morris County, New Jersey (Law Division), Civil Action No. L-001069-05. (February 2007)
- Expert report in BASF Corporation v. Lyondell Chemical Company, Superior Court of Morris County, New Jersey (Law Division), Civil Action No. L-001069-05. (December 2006)
- Court testimony in Marshall, O'Toole, Gerstein, Murray & Borun v. Eazypower, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois (Law Division), Civil Action No. 98 L 013501. (April 2006)
- Court testimony in White v. Heartland High-Yield Municipal Bond Fund, U.S. District Court, Eastern Division of Wisconsin, Civil Action No. 00-C-1388. (December 2005)
- Court testimony in the arbitration between City of Bangor, Maine v. Citizens Communications Company v. Barrett Paving Materials, U.S. District Court, District of Maine, Civil Action No. 02-183-B-S. (September 2005)
- Deposition in Marshall, O'Toole, Gerstein, Murray & Borun v. Eazypower, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois (Law Division), Civil Action No. 98 L 013501. (August 2005)
- Deposition in Neopost Industrie v. PFE International, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois Chicago Division, Civil Action No. 04-C-5047. (June 2005)
- Expert declaration (with Andrew Wong) in Abbott Laboratories v. ANDRX Pharmaceuticals, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, Civil Action No. 05 C01490. (May 2005)

- Expert report in Neopost Industrie v. PFE International, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois Chicago Division, Civil Action No. 04-C-5047. (May 2005)
- Expert report in IPXL Holdings v. Amazon, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Virginia, Civil Action No. 04-CV-70. (July 2004)
- Deposition in White v. Heartland High-Yield Municipal Bond Fund, U.S. District Court, Eastern Division of Wisconsin, Civil Action No. 00-C-1388. (June 2004)
- Affidavit in IPXL Holdings v. Amazon, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Virginia, Civil Action No. 04-CV-70. (June 2004)
- Expert disclosure in Chicopee v. Johnson & Johnson, American Arbitration Association, AAA No. 13 Y 181 010402. (June 2004)
- Expert report in IPXL Holdings v. Amazon, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Virginia, Civil Action No. 04-CV-70. (June 2004)
- Expert report in Marshall, O'Toole, Gerstein, Murray & Borun v. Eazypower, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois (Law Division), Civil Action No. 98 L 013501. (June 2004)
- Deposition in American Century Services v. American International Specialty Lines Insurance, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Civil Action No. 01-CV-8847. (May 2004)
- Expert report in White v. Heartland High-Yield Municipal Bond Fund, U.S. District Court, Eastern Division of Wisconsin, Civil Action No. 00-C-1388. (April 2004)
- Deposition in City of Bangor, Maine v. Citizens Communications Company v. Barrett Paving Materials, U.S. District Court, District of Maine, Civil Action No. 02-183-B-S. (February 2004)
- Testimony in the arbitration between Solvay Pharmaceuticals v. Duramed Pharmaceuticals, American Arbitration Association, Arbitration No. 53 181 00564 02. (January 2004)
- Deposition in the arbitration between Solvay Pharmaceuticals v. Duramed Pharmaceuticals, American Arbitration Association, Arbitration No. 53 181 00564 02. (January 2004)
- Expert report in the arbitration between Solvay Pharmaceuticals v. Duramed Pharmaceuticals, American Arbitration Association, Arbitration No. 53 181 00564 02. (December 2003)
- Declaration in American Century Services v. American International Specialty Lines Insurance, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Civil Action No. 01-CV-8847. (September 2003)
- Expert report in American Century Services v. American International Specialty Lines Insurance, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Civil Action No. 01-CV-8847. (August 2003)
- Testimony in the arbitration between Sceon Lighting Systems v. Snap-on, American Arbitration Association, Arbitration No. 51 Y 181 00577 01. (June 2003)

- Expert report in the arbitration between Abbott Laboratories and Zurich American Insurance Company of Illinois (an international arbitration seated in London). (February 2003)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

- Columbia University and Duke University
Guest Lecturer (2002 - 2004)
- The University of Chicago, Department of Economics and Graduate School of Business
Lecturer (1998 - 1999)
Taught microeconomics (topics included price theory, industrial organization, capital theory, principles of labor economics, and durable goods economics)
- Loyola University Chicago School of Law
Lecturer of Law (1997 - 1998)
Taught antitrust economics

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS:

American Economics Association

OTHER:

Certified Public Accountant

STROZ FRIEDBERG
an Aon company

CURRICULUM VITAE

Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D.

Vice President

Boston, Massachusetts

E geoff.cohen@aon.com

T +1 617.807.8508

53 State Street, Suite 2200, Boston, MA 02109

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

STROZ FRIEDBERG, LLC

Vice President

2015 to Present

ELYSIUM DIGITAL, LLC

Computer Scientist

2005 to 2015

COHERENCE ENGINE

Principal

2003 to 2005

CAP GEMINI ERNST & YOUNG CENTER FOR BUSINESS INNOVATION

Senior Consultant/Manager

1999 to 2002

IBM

Intern

1996 to 1997

DATA GENERAL

Intern

1994 to 1995

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION

Assistant Analyst

1992 to 1994

EDUCATION

DUKE UNIVERSITY

Ph.D., Computer Science, 2001

Dissertation: "Architecture, Implementation, and Applications of Bytecode Transformation"

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

A.B., Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, 1992

STROZ FRIEDBERG
an Aon company

CURRICULUM VITAE

Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D.

Vice President

Boston, Massachusetts

E geoff.cohen@aon.com

T +1 617.807.8508

53 State Street, Suite 2200, Boston, MA 02109

PUBLICATIONS

October 2010: "Targeting Third-Party Collaboration." In *Proc. Deterring CyberAttacks: Informing Strategies and Developing Options for U.S. Policy*.

May 2005: "The Invisible Handshake: Open Source Principles for Business." Monitor Networks White Paper.

2004: "Using Bytecode Transformation to Integrate New Features." In *Aspect-Oriented Software Development*.

2003: "Spaces of the Real: How Sensors Will Change the Way We See the World." *Perspectives on Business Innovation* 9: 79-84.

2002: "The Bionic Organization." Geoff A. Cohen and John S. Parkinson. *Perspectives on Business Innovation* 8: 79-84.

February 2002: "An Open Letter to the Software Nobility." Geoff A. Cohen and Alan Radding. Center for Business Innovation Working Paper.

June 2001: "Travels in Silicon: Reflections on the Center for Business Innovation's Untethered Devices Rave." Geoff A. Cohen and Mukul Kanabar. Center for Business Innovation Working Paper.

2001: "Taking Up Serpents: How ASPs are Changing the Face of Consulting." *Perspectives on Business Innovation* 6: 51-55.

2000: "Pushing Platforms: Corporate Venture Funds." *Perspectives on Business Innovation* 5: 26-32.

October 1999: "Toward Automatic State Management for Replicated Dynamic Web Services." Geoff Berry, Jeff Chase, Geoff Cohen, Landon Cox, and Amin Vahdat. In *Proc. Network Storage Symposium (NETSTORE'99)*.

June 1998: "Automatic Program Transformation with JOIE." Geoff A. Cohen, Jeffrey S. Chase, and David L. Kaminsky. In *Proc. USENIX Annual Technical Conference (ATEC'98)*.

PATENTS

Dynamic object migration method using proxy object links to support automatic object distribution in an object-oriented environment. Geoffrey Alexander Cohen, David Louis Kaminsky, and Richard Adam King. US Patent 6,324,543, filed March 6, 1998, and issued November 27, 2001.

Method and system of running object-oriented programs across a network through compression and distillation of remote method invocation. Geoffrey Alexander Cohen, David Louis Kaminsky, and Jonathan Michael Seeber. US Patent 6,125,400, filed November 10, 1997, and issued September 26, 2000.

Apparatus and method for dynamically modifying class files during loading for execution. Geoffrey Alexander Cohen and Richard Adam King. US Patent 6,072,953, filed September 30, 1997, and issued June 6, 2000.

STROZ FRIEDBERG
an Aon company

CURRICULUM VITAE

Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D.

Vice President

Boston, Massachusetts

E geoff.cohen@aon.com

T +1 617.807.8508

53 State Street, Suite 2200, Boston, MA 02109

Methods, systems, and computer program products for generating client/server applications. Geoffrey Alexander Cohen, James P. Gray, David Louis Kaminsky, Manoj V. S. Kasichainula, Richard Adam King, Zhiyong Li, and Phillip Allan Stone. US Patent 6,011,918, filed April 22, 1998, and issued January 4, 2000.

Process for running applets over non-IP networks. Geoffrey Alexander Cohen, David Louis Kaminsky, Richard Adam King, and Matthew Raymond MacKinnon. US Patent 5,805,829, filed October 1, 1996, and issued September 8, 1998.

PRESS APPEARANCES

August, 26, 2010: "Big Brother and the Civilian Network." Geoff A. Cohen and Jay Stanley. *Homeland Security 2020: The Future of Defending the Homeland*. Day 4: Cyber Security. C-SPAN.

TESTIMONY

2018: *UMG Recordings, Inc. et al. v. Grande Communications Networks LLC et al.*

U.S. District Court, Western District of Texas, Case No. 1:17-cv-00365

Submitted expert report on behalf of Grande Communications Network and Patriot Media Consulting (represented by Armstrong Teasdale) in a copyright matter involving BitTorrent.

2018: *3G Licensing, S.A. et al. v. Blackberry Limited et al.*

U.S. District Court, District of Delaware, Case Nos. 1:17-cv-00082, 83, 84, 85

Submitted multiple declarations regarding claim construction on behalf of 3G Licensing (represented by Susman Godfrey) in a patent matter regarding telecommunications technologies.

2018: *Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions Inc. et al.*

U.S. District Court, District of New Jersey, Case No. 15-cv-07025

Submitted multiple expert reports and was deposed regarding embodiment of asserted patents by Plaintiffs' products and non-infringement of Defendants' products on behalf of Xactware Solutions, Inc. (represented by McCarter & English) in a patent matter regarding roof modeling using aerial imagery.

2017, 2018: *Calendar Research LLC v. StubHub, Inc. et al.*

U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:17-cv-04062

Submitted multiple declarations, expert report, and was deposed on behalf of Calendar Research LLC (represented by Pierce Sergeant) in a trade secret matter involving scheduling software.

2017, 2018: *Vaporstream, Inc. v. Snap Inc. d/b/a Snapchat, Inc.*

U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:17-cv-00220

Was deposed multiple times and submitted declaration and expert report regarding validity and submitted declaration regarding claim construction, on behalf of Vaporstream, Inc. (represented by Susman Godfrey) in a patent matter involving ephemeral data.

2017: *Intellicheck Mobilisa, Inc. v. Wizz Systems LLC*

U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington, Case No. 2:15-cv-00366

STROZ FRIEDBERG
an Aon company

CURRICULUM VITAE

Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D.

Vice President

Boston, Massachusetts

E geoff.cohen@aon.com

T +1 617.807.8508

53 State Street, Suite 2200, Boston, MA 02109

Submitted expert report regarding validity on behalf of Intellicheck Mobilisa, Inc. (represented by Beusse Wolter Sanks & Maire) in a patent matter involving identification validation software.

2015, 2016: *DataTern, Inc. v. Blazent, Inc. et al.*

U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, Case No. 1:11-cv-11970

Was deposed, submitted two declarations concerning claim construction, and submitted two affidavits regarding infringement and validity on behalf of DataTern, Inc. (represented by McCarter & English) in a patent matter regarding object-relational mapping.

2016: *Sisoian v. International Business Machines Corporation*

U.S. District Court, Western District of Texas, Case No. 1:14-cv-00565

Submitted expert report on behalf of International Business Machines Corporation (represented by Yetter Coleman) in a matter involving trade secret allegations pertaining to Smalltalk source code.

2016: *Avid Technology, Inc. v. Media Gobbler, Inc.*

U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, Case No. 1:14-cv-13746

Was deposed and submitted expert report on behalf of Media Gobbler, Inc. (represented by Perkins Coie) in a matter involving allegations of trade secret misappropriation relating to audio file formats.

2015: *In re Application No. 13/447,932 to Collins et al.*

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Submitted declaration on behalf of Vaporstream, Inc.

2015: *Media Bridge LLC v. Clear Channel Outdoor Holdings Inc. et al.*

U.S. District Court, District of Delaware, Case No. 1:15-cv-00122

Submitted declaration on behalf of Media Bridge, LLC (represented by Farnan LLP) in a patent infringement matter regarding interactive mobile advertising platforms.

2015: *SpectorSoft Corporation v. Helios Software, LLC*

United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Case No. 2015-01599

Submitted declaration on behalf of SpectorSoft Corporation (represented by Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox) in support of petition for inter partes review regarding a network monitoring patent.

2013, 2014, and 2015: *Helios Software LLC et al. v. SpectorSoft Corporation*

U.S. District Court, District of Delaware, Case No. 1:12-cv-00081

Testified as an expert witness at trial, was deposed, submitted two expert reports regarding invalidity, and submitted three declarations on behalf of SpectorSoft Corporation (represented by Shartsis Frieze) in a patent case regarding network monitoring.

2014: *PCMS International, Inc. v. 2295113 Canada, Inc.*

Delaware Court of Chancery, Case No. 8406

Was deposed and submitted expert report on behalf of 2295113 Canada, Inc. (represented by Richards Layton & Finger) in a trade secret dispute regarding point of sale system technology.

2014: *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*

U.S. Tax Court, Case No. 31197-12

STROZ FRIEDBERG
an Aon company

CURRICULUM VITAE

Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D.

Vice President

Boston, Massachusetts

E geoff.cohen@aon.com

T +1 617.807.8508

53 State Street, Suite 2200, Boston, MA 02109

Testified and deposed as expert witness and submitted two expert reports on behalf of Commissioner of Internal Revenue in a dispute regarding software valuation.

2013: *CA, Inc. v. New Relic, Inc.*

U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 2:12-cv-05468

Was deposed, submitted two expert reports regarding invalidity and non-infringement, submitted three declarations, and submitted affidavit regarding claim construction on behalf of New Relic, Inc. (represented by Kecker & Van Nest) in a patent case involving application performance management software.

2013: *Internal Revenue Service v. National Treasury Employees Union, Chapter 68*

Testified as expert witness at arbitration on behalf of the National Treasury Employees Union in an employment matter involving reliability of a web application.

2012: *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.*

U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 5:12-cv-00630

Was deposed on two occasions and submitted two declarations on behalf of Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al. (represented by Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan) in a patent matter regarding smartphone user interfaces.

2010: *Toshiba Corporation v. Imation Corp. et al.*

U.S. District Court, Western District of Wisconsin, Case No. 3:09-cv-00305

Submitted declaration on behalf of Imation Corp. et al. (represented by Fish & Richardson) in a patent matter involving DVD reader calibration technology.

2009: *The Matter of Certain Automotive Multimedia Display and Navigation Systems, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same*

U.S. International Trade Commission, Case No. 337-TA-657

Testified as expert witness, was deposed on two occasions, submitted multiple expert reports, and submitted affidavit concerning patent infringement and claim construction on behalf of Honeywell International Inc. (represented by Robins Kaplan) in a patent matter regarding GPS and navigation systems.

2007: *Embassy Software Corporation v. eCopy, Inc.*

U.S. District Court, District of New Hampshire, Case No. 1:06-cv-00391

Submitted expert report on behalf of eCopy, Inc. (represented by Goodwin Procter) in a matter involving allegations of copyright and trade secret misappropriation regarding PDF creation software.

2006: *Omnipoint Holdings, Inc. v. Town of Brookline et al.*

U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, Case No. 1:05-cv-10644

Was deposed in official capacity as member of Town of Brookline committee in a matter regarding PCS technology and the placement of panel antennas in a residential area.

PROFESSIONAL AND CIVIC AFFILIATIONS

- Member, Intelligence Science and Technology Experts Group (ISTEG), National Academy of Sciences, working in support of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI)

STROZ FRIEDBERG
an Aon company

CURRICULUM VITAE

Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D.

Vice President

Boston, Massachusetts

E geoff.cohen@aon.com

T +1 617.807.8508

53 State Street, Suite 2200, Boston, MA 02109

- Member, USACM Council, Public Policy Committee of the Association for Computing Machinery
- National Research Council Workshop on Deterring CyberAttacks
- Peer Reviewer, U.S. Department of Commerce Broadband Technology Opportunities Program

02/19

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504

Joseph L. Mundy
President, Vision Systems Inc.

EDUCATION:

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Ph.D. Electrical Engineering, 1969; M. Engr., 1966; B.E.E., 1963.

GE Career Highlights:

Dr. Mundy joined General Electric's Research and Development Center (CRD) in 1963. His early projects at CRD include: High power microwave tube design, a superconductive computer memory system, the design of high density integrated circuit associative memory arrays, the application of transform coding to image data compression. He is the co-inventor of varactor bootstrapping, a key technique widely used today in the design of MOS integrated circuits. His design of an integrated associative memory cell is still the most compact and requires only 5 MOS transistors.

From 1972 until 2002, Dr. Mundy led a group involved in the research and development of image understanding and computer vision systems. In the early 1970's his group developed one of the first major applications of computer vision to industrial inspection. A system was developed to inspect incandescent lamp filaments at the rate of 15 parts/sec and achieved classification performance of less than one error per thousand. The system operated in production for many years.

During the late 1970's his group developed an extensive system for the inspection of jet engine turbine components involving both 3-d range sensing and ultra-violet imaging of fluorescent crack features. This project involved the use of 3D bicubic CAD models to control the motion of a fifteen-axis inspection machine and the development of high throughput hardware for the processing of flaw image data. A final version of this machine was installed at Kelly AFB and was demonstrated to be superior to human inspectors with significant cost savings in used part recovery. This system pioneered many techniques in CAD model-supported inspection of industrial components.

In the 1980's Dr. Mundy's group began to apply image understanding algorithms to aerial reconnaissance. He developed a system for aircraft recognition based on a sparse feature, called the vertex-pair, which achieved 98% recognition accuracy in a test on realistic airfield scenes.

Dr. Mundy also participated in the development of a novel CAD-based wafer inspection system in the mid-1980s that led to a start up company. The company produced a working prototype in collaboration with Hewlett-Packard. The company, Contrex, was eventually sold to Fairchild Semiconductor.

During the 1990's the group developed the use of X-ray stereo photogrammetry to enable the measurement of internal casting features from multiple X-ray views. The system employs robust statistical bundle adjustment over dozens of views. The 3-d reconstruction achieves an accuracy of better than 0.005'', allowing practical manufacturing metrology. This new approach is currently being used in production by GE's Aircraft Engine division to plan drilling operations for airfoil castings.

While at GE, Dr. Mundy accumulated over 20 granted patents.

Brown University Career Highlights:

Dr. Mundy joined the division of engineering at Brown in 2002 as Professor of Engineering (Research). Prof. Mundy carried out research in including nano-computing architectures with emphasis on CMOS devices with nano-scale gate lengths so that logic operation is dominated by thermal noise. He originated novel logic circuits that produce correct logic results even when random noise dominates the logic signals. He also developed a new approach to analyzing such circuits using queuing theory. These architectures are aimed at the next generation of silicon devices where the gate lengths are only a few nanometers. His research at Brown also included the development of new algorithms for the 3D reconstruction of blood vessel networks from computer tomographic imaging scanners (CT). These vessel networks provide unique information about the effect of cancer drugs on tumors, whose growth is enabled by the evolution of new vessel pathways. This work led to the founding of Bio Tree Systems, a company he co-founded to develop diagnostic tests for the effectiveness of cancer drugs. He also conducted research in aerial reconnaissance for the Department of Defense, including the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency. This work involved the development of new probabilistic representations of 3D space to account for the inherent ambiguity of extracting geometric descriptions from multiple image views. This new representation supports accurate determination of scene dynamics (change detection) in spite of the spatial ambiguity. While at Brown, he advised and graduated eight Ph.D. students who carried out research in image analysis and 3D modeling from imagery.

Vision Systems Career Highlights:

Dr. Mundy left Brown in June 2016 to focus on his company, Vision Systems Inc. (VSI) as President. Vision Systems carries out research on aerial reconnaissance for the Department of Defense and other intelligence agencies. Some current projects at VSI include the fully automated construction of large scale digital elevation models (DEMs) from satellite imagery to support military planning and with commercial application to virtual reality tours for sports such as skiing and mountain biking. This work was funded by the Intelligence Advanced Research Project Agency (IARPA).

VSI also is developing an anatomical model of the human face to improve recognition accuracy in a 4 year research program on facial recognition. This research is also funded by IARPA and has commercial application in the field of plastic surgery. The development of a new model for the human eye anatomy is described in a paper at the Joint Meeting of the American Society of Plastic Surgeons in May 2016. VSI also has an ongoing project on the acquisition of large-scale 3-d models from satellite imagery to detect structural changes in buildings and other infrastructure. As an example, a digital surface model of the entire city of Mosul, Iraq was created fully automatically. This project also includes the automated extraction of polyhedral building models. VSI also is carrying out research for DARPA's Global Change Analysis (GCA) program. The research is focused on automatic description of damage caused by natural disasters such as earthquakes, based on 3-d models before and after the event.

Academic Qualifications:

Dr. Mundy was an adjunct full professor of computer science at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. He taught the core graduate course on Artificial Intelligence from 1975 until 1997. This course was selected to be presented in video format to a wide audience of graduate students at IBM, Xerox and GE.

Dr. Mundy has advised numerous masters and four PhD students in his capacity as adjunct professor. He also has had periodic adjunct appointments in the Department of Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering, where he has taught courses in digital image processing. He is co-taught a course on the application of mathematics to computer vision with Prof. Charles Stewart.

In collaboration with Prof. Deepak Kapur, Dr. Mundy developed new approaches to formal geometric reasoning based on algebraic techniques. These ideas resulted in the development of an automatic geometric theorem proving system called Geometer. Geometer was capable of proving many theorems from plane geometry and perspective construction. This work led to an international workshop on geometric reasoning in 1986 and produced an edited proceeding of the workshop papers.

In 1988, Dr. Mundy received the Coolidge Fellowship, which is GE's highest award of technical achievement recognizing academic impact as well as contribution to GE businesses. The fellowship provides a year sabbatical to carry out basic research.

While on this sabbatical at Oxford University during the years 1988-89, Dr. Mundy initiated a reading course in projective geometry that established a new approach to object modeling and recognition, called geometric invariance. In collaboration with Andrew Zisserman, David Forsyth (now at Berkeley) and a

PhD student Charles Rothwell, these ideas were implemented in a generic object recognition system, called LEWIS.

Geometric invariance research has made significant contributions to our basic understanding of computer vision. Two international workshops have been held, co-chaired by Dr. Mundy and Prof. Andrew Zisserman of Oxford. Both workshops have led to edited books of contributed and invited papers. In the first book, Dr. Mundy prepared an extensive appendix on the application of projective geometry in computer vision that has been influential to many research groups.

Dr. Mundy's most recent topics of research at GE were the integration of perceptual grouping and photometric theory with the goal of understanding 3-d textures. He also developed a Bayesian model-based approach to the segmentation of lung tissue in CT images.

He continued to foster basic research within his group at GE, including the work of Dr. Richard Hartley who made major contributions to the fundamental understanding of 3-d model reconstruction from multiple views.

His laboratory pioneered a new approach to constructing 3D models from satellite imagery based on a probabilistic volumetric algorithm this work lead to a best paper award from the American Society of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing in 2011. He was also principal investigator on a number of military surveillance projects funded by DARPA, NGA and Lockheed Martin. He and his students contributed to an extensive C++ library for computer vision processing called VXL, which is still under active use and extension by the computer vision research community.

3

Government-Sponsored Research Projects:

Dr. Mundy received his first Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) grant in 1985, under DARPA's basic research program in image understanding (IU). The DARPA IU research community represents many of the leading university computer vision groups. Thus it was a significant recognition of his research achievements to be selected. His research has continued to be funded by DARPA through a number of competitive grant procurements.

From 1992-1996, he was a principal contributor to DARPA's RADIUS project, providing algorithms to the RADIUS Test bed System (RTS) that makes use of the context provided by a 3D site model. These algorithms include change detection based on various levels of image segmentation and specific object structure matching. He has continued the development of context-based change detection and image registration through the FOCUS program, which has continued to develop automated exploitation tools in a

site model framework. The FOCUS system has been successfully demonstrated on operational imagery in support of NIMA applications.

He was chairman of DARPA's Image Understanding Environment (IUE) Committee, which has specified and supervised the development of the IUE. The IUE is an extensive C++ hierarchy of computational structures in support of image understanding research programming. This object-oriented design was the first comprehensive study of the representations inherent in computer vision algorithms. This work led to special recognition by DARPA.

Dr. Mundy played a lead technical role in DARPA's Dynamic Database (DDB) program, an ambitious effort to automatically extract situation hypotheses from a continuous stream of imagery from a variety of sensors. He was responsible for the DDB object model to support the integration of algorithms supplied by many contractors. This model extended the IUE to incorporate reasoning about dynamic scenes.

He was principal investigator on a project to integrate natural language and computer vision in the analysis of video news sequences. This contract is supported by a newly formed government body called the Advanced Research and Development Agency (ARDA) that is focused on supporting research specifically aimed at the intelligence community.

4

Professional Activities:

Dr. Mundy's professional activities involve active participation in the areas of computer vision and image understanding over three decades. He has served on many program committees and review bodies including: International Conference on Computer Vision, Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition and various SPIE conferences.

Some highlights:

- Co-chairman of the workshop on industrial applications of machine vision that resulted in a special issue of the IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI), 1980.
- Chairman, International Workshop on Geometric Reasoning, Oxford, 1986.
- Co-Chairman, International Workshop on the Integration of Symbolic and Numeric Computing, Saratoga 1990.
- Co-Chairman, 1st International Workshop on Geometric Invariants, Reykjavik, Iceland, 1991.

- Co-Chairman, 2nd International Workshop on Geometric Invariants, Ponta Delgada, Azores, 1993.
- Co-chairman of the IEEE workshop on Context-Based Vision held in conjunction with ICCV, Cambridge MA, 1995.

5

- Co-chairman DARPA workshop on Shape, Contour and Grouping in Computer Vision, Palermo, Sicily, 1999.
- Co-chairman IEEE workshop on the Integration of Appearance and Geometry in Object Recognition, Fort Collins, CO, 1999.
- Member, Editorial Board, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (PAMI) 1987-90
- Member, Editorial Board, *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 1989-present.
- Member, advisory board of NSF for artificial intelligence and robotics (IRIS) 1986-1998.
- Area Chair, 2001 Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern

Honors and Awards:

- Best paper award from the American Society of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing in 2011.
- Co-recipient of the Marr Prize, 1993. The Marr Prize is awarded for the best paper at the International Conference on Computer Vision, and is considered a major honor in computer vision.
- Invited visitor to the Newton Institute of Mathematics at Cambridge University, summer 1993. Co-chaired a workshop at the Newton Institute on object recognition.
- Best Paper Award, British Machine Vision Conference, 1991.
- Invited keynote speaker, Swedish Conference on Computer Vision, 1980.
- Elected a Coolidge Fellow, 1987, General Electric's highest recognition for outstanding technical achievement.
- Best Paper Award, GE Symposium on Statistics, 1979.
- Best Paper Award, GE Symposium on Solid State Applications, 1976.

6

- Eta Kappa Nu, honors fraternity.

Publications

a. Books

Geometric Reasoning, Kapur, D. and Mundy, J.L., editors, MIT Press, 1989.

Symbolic and Numerical Computation for Artificial Intelligence, Donald, B., Kapur, D., and Mundy, J.L., editors, Academic Press, 1992

Geometric Invariance in Computer Vision, Mundy, J.L., Zisserman, A. , MIT Press, 1992.

Applications of Invariance in Computer Vision, Mundy, J.L., Zisserman, A. and Forsyth D., editors, LNCS 825, Springer Verlag, 1994.

Shape, contour and grouping in Computer Vision, D. Forsyth, J. Mundy, V. Di Gesù, R. Cipolla, LNCS 1681, 1999.

b. Book Chapters

Automatic Visual Inspection, Mundy, J.L., in **Applications of Pattern Recognition**, K.S. Fu, Editor, CRC Press, 1982.

Robotic Vision, Mundy, J.L. in **Advances in Automation and Robotics**, Vol 1 pp 141-208, JAI Press, 1985.

A Three Dimensional Sensor Based on Structured Light, Mundy, J.L. and Porter, G.B, in **3D Vision**, edited by T. Kanade, 1987.

Experiments in Using a Theorem Prover to Prove and Develop Geometrical Theorems in Computer Vision, Mundy, J.L. and Swain, M., **Proc. IEEE Conference on Robotics and Automation**, p280, 1986.

Reprinted in **Readings in Computer Vision** M. Fischler and O. Ferschein, Eds., Morgan-Kaufmann, 1987.

Industrial Machine Vision - Is It Practical?, Mundy, J. L., in **Machine Vision, Algorithms, Architectures and Systems**, H. Freeman, Ed. Academic Press, 1988.

Applications of Range Image Sensing and Processing, in **Analysis and Interpretation of Range Images**, R.Jain and A.Jain Eds, Springer-Verlag, 1990.

Applications of Invariant Theory in Vision, Forsyth, D.A., Mundy, J.L., Zisserman, A. and Rothwell, C.A., in **Integrating Symbolic and Numerical Methods for Artificial Intelligence**, Academic Press, 1992.

Symbolic Representation of Object Models, in **Active Perception and Robotic Vision**, A. Sood and H. Wexler Eds., Springer Verlag, 1992.

Object recognition in the geometric era: a retrospective, in **Towards Category-level object recognition**, J. Ponce and M. Hebert and C. Schmid and A.Zisserman, eds., Springer Verlag, 2007.

c. Refereed and invited articles

Thermodynamical Systems Involving Magnetic Fields, Mundy, J. and Newhouse, V., **American Journal of Physics**, Vol. 34, 1966, p.1198.

Multicrossover Cryotron - A High Gain Single Stage Amplifier, Mundy, J.L. and Newhouse, V., Joynton, R.E. and Meicklejohn, W., **Review of Scientific Instruments**, Vol. 38, 1967, p.798.

A New Cryogenic Memory System, Mundy, J.L. and Newhouse, V., **IEEE Transactions on Magnetics**, Vol. MAG-4, 1968, p.705.

Direct Measurement of Strain on T_c in Thin Films, Mundy, J.L. and Friday, B., **Journal of Applied Physics**, Vol. 40, 1969, p. 2162.

Shortening in MOS Transistors during Junction Walk-Out, Neugebauer, C., Burgess, J., Joynton, R.E. and Mundy, J.L., **Applied Physics Letters**, Vol. 19, 1971, p. 287.

Eliminating Threshold Losses in MOS Circuits by Varactor Bootstrapping, Joynson, R.E., Mundy, J.L., Burgess, J. and Neugebauer, C., **Proc. IEEE**, Vol. 59, 1971 p.1365.

Eliminating Threshold Losses in MOS Circuits by Bootstrapping Using Varactor Coupling, Joynson, R.E., Mundy, J.L., Burgess, J. and Neugebauer, C. **IEEE Journal of Solid State Circuits**, Vol SC-7, 1972, p. 217.

Low Cost Associative Memory, Mundy, J.L, Burgess, J., Joynson, R.E., Neugebauer, C., **IEEE Journal of Solid State Circuits**, Vol. SC-7, p364, 1972.

The Application of Unitary Transforms to Visual Pattern Recognition, Mundy, J.L. and Joynson, R.E., **Proc. 1st International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition**, p390, 1973.

A Line Description System Based on Hadamard Features, Joynson, R.E., Mundy, J.L., and Banerji, R., **Proc. 2nd International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition**, p204, 1974.

One Pass Contouring of Images Through Planar Approximation, Sommerville, C. and Mundy, J.L., **Proc. 3rd International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition**, p 745, 1976.

Automatic Visual Inspection Using Syntactic Analysis, Mundy, J.L. and Joynson, R.E., **Proc. IEEE Conference on Pattern Recognition and Image Processing**, p144, 1977.

Web Representation of Image Data, Hsu, S. and Mundy, J.L.,
Proc. 4th International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition, p 675, 1978.

Automatic Visual Inspection of Blind Holes in Metal Surfaces, Porter, G.B., Cipolla, T.M. and Mundy, J.L., **Proc IEEE Conference on Pattern Recognition and Image Processing**, p83, 1979.

Regionization of Image Data Using Surface Approximation, Hsu, S. and Mundy, J.L., **Proc IEEE Conference on Pattern Recognition and Image Processing**, p314, 1979.

Visual Inspection of Metal Surfaces, Mundy, J.L. and Porter, G.B. **Proc. 5th International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition**, p232, 1980.

Parameter Selection of Network Approximation of Images, Hsu, S. and Mundy, J.L., **Proc. 5th International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition**, p943, 1980.

A Table Driven Visual Inspection Module, Porter, G. and Mundy, J.L., **Proc. 1st Symposium of Robotic Research**, Bretton Woods, 1983.

Reasoning About Three Dimensional Space, Mundy J.L., **Proc. IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation**, 1985.

Reasoning About 3-D Space With Algebraic Deduction, Mundy, J.L., **Proc. 3rd International Symposium on Robotics Research**, p117, 1986.

3D Object Recognition From an Unconstrained Viewpoint, Thompson, D. and Mundy, J., **Proc. IEEE Conf. on Robotics and Automation**, April, 1987.

Model-Based Motion Analysis - Motion From Motion, Thompson, D. and Mundy, J., **Proc. 4th International Symposium on Robotics Research**, p. 299, 1987.

Matching from 3-d Range Models into 2-d Intensity Scenes, Connoly, C.I., Mundy, J.L., Stenstrom, R. and Thompson, D. **Proc. 1st International Conference on Computer Vision**, 1987.

Wu's Method and Its Application to Perspective Viewing, Kapur, D. and Mundy J., **Artificial Intelligence**, Vol. 37, p.15, Dec. 1988.

A Multi-Level Geometric Reasoning System For Vision, **Artificial Intelligence**, Barry, M. and Mundy, J., Vol. 37, p. 275, Dec. 1988.

Projectively Invariant Representations Using Implicit Algebraic Curves, Rothwell, C. , Forsyth, D., Mundy, J. and Zisserman, A., **Proc. 1st European Conference on Computer Vision**, p. 427, 1990.

Benchmark Evaluation of a Model-Based Object Recognition System, Heller A. and Mundy, J.L. **Proc. 3rd International Conference on Computer Vision**, p. 268, 1990.

Invariance - A New Framework for Vision, Forsyth, D., Mundy, J.L., Zisserman, A. and Brown, C., **Proc. 3rd International Conference on Computer Vision**, , p. 268, 1990.

Relative Motion and Pose from Invariants , Zisserman, A., Marinos, C., Forsyth, D., Mundy J.L. and Rothwell, C.A., **Proc. British Machine Vision Association Conference**, 1990.

Projectively Invariant Representations Using Implicit Algebraic Curves, Forsyth, D., Mundy, J.L., Zisserman, A. and Brown, C., **Image and Vision Computing**, 9, 2, 130-136, 1991.

Modeling Polyhedra with Constraints, J.L. Mundy **Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition**, p479, 1991.

Invariant Descriptors for 3D Object Recognition and Pose **IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence**, p.971, Oct., 1991

Projectively Invariant Representations Using Implicit Algebraic Curves, **Image and Vision Computing**, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 130, 1991.

Transformational Invariance - a Primer, Forsyth, D., Mundy, J.L. and Zisserman, A., **Image and Vision Computing**, 10, 1992

Recognizing Rotationally Symmetric Surfaces From Their Outlines, **Proc. European Conference on Computer Vision**, p.639, 1992.

Template Guided Visual Inspection, Noble, A., Nguyen, V.D., Marinos, C., Tran, A.T., Farley, J., Hedengren, K and Mundy, J., **Proc. European Conference on Computer Vision**, p. 893, 1992.

An Object-Oriented Approach to Template-Guided Visual Inspection, Mundy, J., Noble, A., Marinos, C., Nguyen, V.D. , Heller, A. Farley, J. and Tran, A.T., **Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition**,
p. 386, 1992.

Efficient Model Library Access by Projectively Invariant Indexing Functions, Rothwell, C., Zisserman, A, Forsyth, D. and J.L. Mundy, **Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition**, p. 109, 1992.

Efficient recognition of rotationally symmetric surface and straight homogeneous generalized cylinders, **Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition**, 1993.

Extracting Projective Structure From Single Perspective Views of 3D Pointsets, Rothwell, C. Zisserman, A. Forsyth, D. and Mundy, J.L., **Proc. 4th International Conference on Computer Vision**, 1993.

Planar Object Recognition Using Projective Shape Representation, C.A. Rothwell, A. Zisserman, D.A. Forsyth, J.L. Mundy, **International Journal of Computer Vision**, 16, 1995, invited.

Toward Template-Based Tolerancing from a Bayesian Viewpoint, Noble, J.A. and Mundy, J.L. **Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition**, 1993.

Applications of Computer Vision, Grimson, W.E.L and Mundy, J.L., **Comm. ACM**, 37, 45-51, 1994, invited.

The Development of the Image Understanding Environment, Kohl, C. and Mundy, J.L., **Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition**, 1994.

Driving Vision by Topology, C. Rothwell, J. Mundy, W. Hoffman, and V.-D. Nguyen, In **Proceedings IEEE Symposium on Computer Vision**, 1995

3D Object Recognition Using Invariance, Zisserman, A., Forsyth, D., Mundy, J.L., Rothwell, C., Liu, J., **Special Issue on Computer Vision, Artificial Intelligence**, 1995.

The Image Understanding Environment Program, J.L. Mundy and the IUE Committee, **IEEE Expert/Intelligent Systems & Their Applications**, 1995, invited.

Representing objects using topology, C. Rothwell, J. Mundy, and W. Hoffman. In **Proceedings International Workshop on Object Representations in Computer Vision**, 1996.

An Experimental Comparison of Appearance and Geometric Model Based Recognition, J. Mundy and A. Liu and N. Pillow and A. Zisserman and S. Abdallah and Sven Utcke and S. Nayar and C. Rothwell, **Proceedings International Workshop on Object Representations in Computer Vision**, 1996

Object Recognition Based on Geometry: Progress over Three Decades, J.L. Mundy, **Philosophical Transactions:Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, of the Royal Society**, Vol 356, pp 1213-1231, 1998, invited.

An Integrated Boundary and Region Approach to Perceptual Grouping, A. Hoogs and J.L. Mundy, **Proc. International Conf on Pattern Recognition**, 2000, p 284.

A Common Set of Perceptual Observables for Grouping Figure-Ground Discrimination and 3-d Texture Classification, A. Hoogs, R. Collins, R. Kaucic and J. Mundy, **IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence**, April 2003.

A Probabilistic Approach to Nano-computing, J. Chen, J. Mundy, Y. Bai, S. M. Chan, P. Petrica and I. R. Bahar, **IEEE Workshop on Non-silicon Computing**, San Diego, CA, 2003.

A Probabilistic-based Design Methodology for Nanoscale Computation, I. R. Bahar, J. Mundy and J. Chen, **IEEE ICCAD**, San Jose, CA, Nov. 2003.

A Probabilistic-based Design Methodology for Nanoscale Computer Architecture, J. Chen, J. Mundy, and I. R. Bahar, **International Workshop on Logic and Synthesis**, Laguna Beach, CA, May 2003.

Object Recognition in the Geometric Era: A Retrospective, J. Mundy, **International Workshop on Recognition and Learning**, Sicily Italy, Sept. 2003.

Video Surveillance Research in Support of Port Security, J. Mundy, **IEEE Homeland Security Technology Workshop**, Warwick RI, Nov. 2003.

Figure-ground Segmentation and Object Tracking in Video using Curve Matching, V. Jain, B. Kimia and J. Mundy, **Proc. European Conference on Computer Vision**, Workshop on Spatial Coherence in Visual Motion Analysis, May 2004.

,

Fusion of intensity, texture, and color in video tracking based on mutual information, J. Mundy and C-F. Chang, **Proc. IEEE Conf. AIPR**, 2004.

A Probabilistic-Based Design for Nanoscale Computation, Chapter 5 in, **Nano, Quantum and Molecular Computing: Implications to High Level Design and Validation**, R. I. Bahar, J. Chen, and J. Mundy, S. Shukla and R.I. Bahar, eds, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004

Designing Logic Circuits for Probabilistic Computation in the Presence of Noise, K. Nepal , R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky, **IEEE/ACM Design Automation Conference**, June 2005.

Designing MRF based Error Correcting Circuits for Memory Elements, K. Nepal , R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky, **IEEE/ACM Design Automation and Test in Europe Conference**. to appear March 2006.

K. Nepal, R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky, "The

MRF Reinforcer: A Probabilistic Element for Space Redundancy in

Nanoscale Circuits," IEEE MICRO, Vol. 26, No. 5, September/October 2006., pp. 19–27.

Designing Nanoscale Logic Circuits based on Markov Random Fields, K. Nepal, R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky,

Journal of Electronic Testing: Theory and Applications, accepted for publication.

Designing MRF based Error Correcting Circuits for Memory Elements, K. Nepal, R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky,

IEEE/ACM Design Automation and Test in Europe Conference,

March 2006, interactive presentation. Acceptance rate approx. 25%

A Model for Soft Errors in the Subthreshold CMOS Inverter, H. Li, J. Mundy, W. Patterson, D. Kazazis, A. Zaslavsky and R. I. Bahar, **Workshop on**

SELSE 2, System Effects of Logic Soft Errors, April 2006.

,

Optimizing Noise-Immune Logic Circuits using Principles of Markov Random Fields, K. Nepal, R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky,

IEEE/ACM Great Lakes Symposium on VLSI, May 2006. Acceptance rate approx. 30%.

Techniques for MRF based implementation of multi-level combinational

circuits, K. Nepal, R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky,

IEEE Workshop on Defect and Fault Tolerant Nanoscale Architectures (NANOARCH 2006), held in conjunction with the

International Symposium on Computer Architecture, June 2006.

Techniques for Designing Noise-Tolerant Multi-level Combinational Circuits, K. Nepal, R. I. Bahar, J. Mundy, W. R. Patterson, and A. Zaslavsky,

IEEE/ACM Design Automation and Test in Europe Conference,

April 2007 Acceptance rate approx. 25%

Learning Background and Shadow Appearance with 3-D Vehicle Models, M. J. Leotta and J. L. Mundy. **Proc. British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC)**. Sept 2006. Vol 2, pp. 649-658

Automated Change Detection Based on Multi-modal Fusion, Pollard, T. , Mundy, J. L., Cooper, D., **Proc. National Geospatial Intelligence Agency Symposium, Proc.**, October, 2006.

Automated Change Detection Based on

Multi-modal Fusion, Pollard, T. , Mundy, J. L., Cooper, D. **Intelligence Agency Academic Summit, Proc.**, June ,2007.

Epipolar Curve Tracking in 3-D., M. J. Leotta and J. L. Mundy.

In **IEEE International Conference on Image Processing 2007 (ICIP)**.

Sept 2007. Vol. 6, pp. 325-328

Thermally-induced soft errors in nanoscale CMOS circuits ,Li, H. Mundy, J. Patterson, W. Kazazis, D. Zaslavsky, A. Bahar, R. I. ,

IEEE International Symposium on Nanoscale Architectures, NANOSARCH, Oct. 2007

Change detection in a 3-d world, T. Pollard and J. Mundy.. In **Proc. IEEE Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference**, June 2007.

Automated Change Detection Based on Multi-modal Fusion (Geospatial Registration) ," Eden, I , Mundy, J. L., Cooper, D. , **Intelligence Agency Academic Summit**, Proc., June ,2008.

Image and Video Registration in a 3-d World, Mundy, J.L., **Proc. NGA Geopositioning Workshop**, August, 2008.

Parallax-Free Video Registration, Crispell, D., Mundy, J. and Taubin, G., **Proc. British Machine Vision Conf.**, Sept. 2008.

Automated Change Detection Based on Multi-modal Fusion, Mundy, J.L., Invited Keynote Address at **United States Geospatial Intelligence Foundation Symposium**, October, 2008.

Lie Group distance based generic 3-d Vehicle Classification, Yarlagadda, P. Ozcanli, O., Mundy, J.L., **Proc. International Conference on Pattern Recognition**, December, 2008.

NorMaL: Non-compact Markovian Likelihood for Change Detection, Sezer, O., Mundy, J.L., Altunbasak, Y. and Cooper, D., **Proc. International Conference on Pattern Recognition**, December, 2008.

Markov Chain Analysis of Thermally Induced Soft Errors in Sub-threshold Nanoscale CMOS Circuits, Sabou, F., Kazazis, D. Bahar, R., Mundy, J., Patterson, W., Zaslavsky, A. **IEEE Transactions on Device and Materials Reliability**, to appear 2010.

A Volumetric Approach to Change Detection in Satellite Images, Pollard, T. , Eden, I. , Mundy, J. , and Cooper, D. , **Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing Journal**, to appear 2010.

Uncertain Geometry: A New Approach to Modeling for Recognition,

Mundy, J.L., Ozcanli, O.C., **Proceedings of SPIE Defense, Security and Sensing Conference**, April 2009. (Received Automatic Target Recognition (ATR) 2009 Best Paper Award)

Predicting High Resolution Image Edges with a Generic, Adaptive, 3-D Vehicle Model, Leotta, M. J., Mundy, J. L. , **Proc. IEEE Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference**, June 2009. pp 1311-1318

Vehicle Recognition as Changes in Satellite Imagery, Ozcanli, O., Mundy, J.L., **Proc. International Conference on Pattern Recognition(ICPR)**, 2010

Vehicle Surveillance with a Generic, Adaptive, 3-D Vehicle Model, Leotta, M. , Mundy, J.L., **IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence**, Nov. 2010. <http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/TPAMI.2010.217>

Numerical queue solution of thermal noise-induced soft errors in subthreshold CMOS devices, Jannaty, P., Sabou, Florian F., Bahar, R. I., Mundy, J.L., Patterson, W., Zaslavsky, A. , **GLSVLSI '10 Proceedings of the 20th symposium on Great lakes symposium on VLSI**. 2010.

Full Two-Dimensional Markov Chain Analysis of Thermal Soft Errors in Subthreshold Nanoscale CMOS Devices, Jannaty, P. , Sabou, F. Bahar, I. Mundy, J. , Patterson, W., Zaslavsky, A., **IEEE Transactions on Device and Materials Reliability**, 2010.

Two-Dimensional Markov Chain Analysis of Radiation-Induced Soft Errors in Subthreshold Nanoscale CMOS Devices, Jannaty, P. , Sabou, F. C., Gadlage, M. Bahar, R. I. , Mundy, J., Patterson, W., Reed, R. A., Weller, R. A., Schrimpf, R., and D. Zaslavsky, A., **IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science**, Volume:57, Issue:6, pp. 3768-3774., Dec. 2010.

Shot-Noise-Induced Failure in Nanoscale Flip-Flops—Part I: Numerical Framework, Jannaty, P., Sabou, F. C., Son T. Le, Donato, M. , Bahar, R. I. , Patterson, W., Mundy, J., Zaslavsky, A. , **IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices**, Vol. 59, No. 3, March 2012, pp. 800-806.

Shot-Noise-Induced Failure in Nanoscale Flip-Flops—Part II: Failure Rates in 10nm Ultimate CMOS, Jannaty, P., Sabou, F. C., Son T. Le, Donato, M. , Bahar, R. I. , Patterson, W., Mundy, J., Zaslavsky, A., **IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices**, Vol. 59, No. 3, March 2012, pp. 807-812.

Full Two-Dimensional Markov Chain Analysis of Thermal Soft Errors in Subthreshold Nanoscale CMOS Devices, Jannaty, P., Sabou, F. C., Son T. Le, Donato, M. , Bahar, R. I. , Patterson, W., Mundy, J. ,Zaslavsky, A., Jannaty, P. , Sabou, F. Bahar, I. Mundy, J. , Patterson, W., Zaslavsky, A., **IEEE Transactions on Device and Materials Reliability**, Vol. 11, No. 1, March 2011, pp. 50-59. DOI link: 10.1109/TDMR.2010.2069100

A Noise-Immune Sub-Threshold Circuit Design Based on Selective use of Schmitt-Trigger Logic, Donato, M., Cremona, F. , Jin, W., Bahar, R. I. , Patterson, W. , Zaslavsky, A., Mundy, J. , **ACM Great Lakes Symposium on VLSI**, May 2012. Regular paper.

Designing, Fabricating, and Testing Noise Immune Circuits, Donato, M. , Jannaty, P. , Nepal, K. , Bahar, R. I. , Mundy, J. , Patterson, W. R. , and Zaslavsky, A. , **2011 Subthreshold Microelectronics Conference** , Sept. 2011.

Designing Noise-Immune CMOS Circuits for Sub-Threshold Operation Using Schmitt-Trigger Logic, Donato, M., Nepal, K. , Bahar, R. I. , Patterson, W. , Zaslavsky, A., Mundy, J. , **IEEE North Atlantic Test Symposium**, May 2011.

Object Recognition in Probabilistic 3D Volumetric Scenes, Restrepo, M.I, Mayer, B.A, and Mundy, J.L., **International Conference of Pattern Recognition Application and Methods** (ICPRAM), February 2012

High Resolution Surveillance Video Compression using JPEG2000 Compression of Random Variables , Biris, O. and Mundy, J.L., **International Conference on Computer Vision Theory and Applications** (VISAPP), February, 2012.

Restrepo, M. I., and Mundy, J. L. , "An Evaluation of 3-d Local Descriptors in Probabilistic Volumetric Scenes", **British Machine Vision Conference**, Guilford, UK, Sept. 2012

Restrepo, M. I., Mayer, B. A. , Ulusoy, A. O., and Mundy, J. L., "Characterization of 3-d Volumetric Probabilistic Scenes for Object Recognition.", **IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing**, vol. 6, issue Emerging Techniques in 3-D, pp. 522-537, Sept. 2012

Calakli, F., A. O. Ulusoy, M. I. Restrepo, Mundy, J. L. and Taubin, G., "High Resolution Surface Reconstruction from Multi-view Aerial Imagery", **3D Imaging Modeling Processing Visualization Transmission** (3DIMPVT), Oct. 2012.

Ulusoy, A.O. and Mundy, J.L., "Dynamic Probabilistic Volumetric Models," Proc. **International Conference on Computer Vision**, Dec. 2013.

Mayer, B. and Mundy, J., "Duration Dependent Codebooks for Change Detection," Proc. **British Machine Vision Conference**, Sept. 2014.

Ulusoy, A.O. and Mundy, J.L., "Image-Based 4-d Reconstruction Using 3-d Change Detection," **Proc. European Conference on Computer Vision**, Sept. 2014

Ozcanli, O.C. Dong,Y., Mundy, J.L., Webb,H., Hammoud, R., Tom V., "Automatic Geolocation Correction of Satellite Imagery," **International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)**, Volume 116, Issue 3, pp 263-277, 2016.

Biris, O., Ulusoy, A.O. and Mundy J.L, "Compression of Probabilistic Volumetric Models using multi-resolution scene flow," **Image and Vision Computing**, vol. 64, pp. 79-89, 2017.

Crispell, D., Biris, O., Crosswhite, N., Byrne, J., Mundy, J.L., "Dataset Augmentation for Pose and Lighting Invariant Face Recognition," **Proc. IEEE Applied Imagery Pattern Recognition Workshop (AIPR)**, 2017.

Consultancies:

July 2003 – March 2004

Consultant to the Defense Advanced Projects Agency (DARPA)

Study of the application of three-dimensional light radar scanning to urban warfare reconnaissance

Approx Sept. 2001 – 2009

Expert Defense Witness for Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP

Plaintiff Scanner Corp, Defendant Icos Corp. Testified in trial (judge only)

Technology: 3-d measurement of ball grid arrays

Approx. 2002- 2004

Expert Defense Witness for Foley Hoag LLP

Plaintiff Cognex Corp, Defendant Electro Scientific Industries Inc.

Technology: Recognition and placement of surface-mounted devices

Sept. 2003 – Dec. 2003

Technical Expert for Foley Hoag LLP

Plaintiff Pourchez Corp., Defendant, Diatek Corp.

Scientific analysis of dialysis catheter geometry using computer vision

Jan. 2003 – 2010

Contractor to Lockheed Martin Corporation

Technology: Automated vehicle tracking from aerial platforms, change detection from reconnaissance imagery, high throughput video processing on airborne platforms

Jan. 2005 – Present

Technical Expert for August Technology Corporation, and Rudolph Technologies, Inc., plaintiff against Camtek LTD, inspection of semiconductor devices. Testified in jury trial.

Jan. 2006 – 2008

Consultant to Toyon Research Corporation of Santa Barbara

Technology: Automated target recognition from infrared imagery.

Jan. 2009 – 2012

Consultant to Defense Advanced Projects Agency (DARPA) Transparent Earth Initiative

Jun. 2009 – May. 2010

Technical Expert for Fuji Inc. and MVTec Software GmbH defendant against Cognex Inc. plaintiff, detection of patterns on electronic semiconductor devices, testified before the ITC.

Nov. 2010 – Jan. 2011

Patent prior art analysis for Crowell and Moring on computer image generation.

Sept. 2012 – Jan. 2013

Technical Expert for Microsoft and other defendants, *Transcenic v Microsoft et al* . Technology involves generating synthetic street views based on human interaction.

Dec. 2014 – Oct. 2017 Technical Expert for the defendant LG Electronics, *Advanced Micro Devices vs. LG Electronics* Technology involves computer user interfaces based on recognition of gestures as captured by a video camera.

Mar. 2016 – Present Technical Expert for the defendant *Xactware Solutions, Inc. and Verisk Analytics, Inc., vs. Eagle View Technologies, Inc. and Pictometry International Corp.* The technology involves interactive 3D modeling of roof structures from aerial imagery.

Dec. 2017 – Present Technical Expert for the plaintiff *Carl Zeiss AG and ASML Netherlands B.V. v. Nikon Corporation, Sendai Nikon Corporation, and Nikon Inc.* The technology involves automated face detection and tracking by cameras.

Nov. 2017 – Present Technical Expert for the defendant *Exocad GMBH and Exocad America, Inc. v. 3Shape A/S*, Inter Partes Review. The technology involves synthetic rendering of dental repair and augmentation applied to a facial model of the patient.

PHILIP GREEN

POSITION	Principal of Hoffman Alvary & Company LLC Phone: (617) 209-5106 philgreen@hoffmanalvary.com
EDUCATION	B.A., History, 1984 – Rutgers College M.B.A., Accounting, 1987 – Rutgers Graduate School of Management
PROFESSIONAL AND BUSINESS HISTORY	1996 – Present: Principal Hoffman Alvary & Company LLC, Newton, MA 1994 – 1996: Price Waterhouse LLP, Manager/Senior Manager, Dispute Analysis and Corporate Recovery Services, New York 1988 – 1994: Executive Consultant, Peterson Consulting Limited Partnership, New York 1987 – 1988: Staff Accountant, Ernst & Whinney, New York 1984 – 1985: Paralegal, Anderson, Russell, Kill & Olick, Washington, D.C. and New York <u>Dispute Analysis Consulting</u> – Accounting, financial analysis, and valuation assistance in connection with litigated matters focusing on intellectual property infringements, contract breaches, professional malpractice and investigations before the International Trade Commission. Work has included the calculation of lost profits and reasonable royalty damages, forensic and investigative accounting, valuation, opinions regarding commercial success and the evaluation of domestic industry and remedy issues. This assistance has been provided to a broad range of industries including: computer software and hardware, telecommunications and electronics companies, pharmaceutical, medical device, and biotechnology entities, and steel, glass and other manufacturers. Served as expert witness on damages, royalties, valuation and accounting-related issues. <u>Other Consulting</u> – Engagements related to intangible assets have included preparation of valuations in connection with purchases, sales and donations, royalty auditing and development of patent and intellectual property licensing strategies. Other consulting assistance has included business valuations, providing opinions on the “fairness” of compensation in transactions, and assistance with issues related to bankrupt or troubled companies.
PROFESSIONAL AND BUSINESS AFFILIATIONS	Certified Public Accountant – Registered to Practice by the State of New York Certified Management Accountant Accredited in Business Valuation by the AICPA Accredited Senior Appraiser – Business Valuation Member, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants Member, New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants Member, Institute of Certified Management Accountants Member, American Society of Appraisers Member, Licensing Executive Society

Philip Green

Testimony – January 2013 – Present

*Smartphone Technologies LLC v. Apple Inc. and LG Electronics, Inc., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

*Endo Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*Galderma Laboratories Inc. et al. v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC et al., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*Ventria Bioscience v. Daichang Yang, Superior Court – Sacramento County California – Deposition

*Certain Electronic Devices, Including Wireless Communication Devices, Tablet Computers, Media Players, and Televisions, and Components Thereof, Investigation No. 337-TA-862, International Trade Commission – Deposition and Hearing before Judge Shaw

*Alcon Pharmaceuticals LTD et al. v. Apotex Inc. et al., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*GeoTag, Inc. v. Frontier Communications Corp. et al., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

Paige Landscape Company, Inc. v. Apple D'Or Maintenance, Inc., Superior Court – Worcester County Massachusetts – Trial

*Certain Wireless Communication Base Stations and Components Thereof, Investigation No. 337-TA-871, International Trade Commission – Deposition

*Google, Inc. v. GeoTag, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*Ethox Chemicals LLC v. The Coca-Cola Company, Federal Court – District of South Carolina – Deposition

*Columbia Data Products, Inc. v. Autonomy Corporation Limited et al., Federal Court – District of Massachusetts – Deposition

*Mass Engineered, Inc. v. Humanscale, Inc., Federal Court – Eastern District of Virginia – Deposition

*Ascion LLP et al. v. Rouey Lung, Inc. et al., Federal Court – District of Massachusetts – Trial before Judge O'Toole

*Cheese Systems Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys., Inc. et al., Federal Court – Western District of Wisconsin – Trial before Judge Crabb

*Certain Point-to-Point Network Communication Devices and Products Containing Same, Investigation No. 337-TA-892, International Trade Commission – Deposition

* Denotes matter involving intellectual property

*In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Nortel Networks Corporation et al., Ontario Superior Court of Justice and United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware – Deposition and Trial

*GeoTag, Inc. v. Starbucks Corp. et al., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

*B. Ravo and E. Nicolo v. Covidien LP, Federal Court – Western District of Pennsylvania – Deposition

*Trebro Manufacturing, Inc. v. FireFly Equipment, LLC, Federal Court – District of Montana – Deposition

Finn v. Ballentine Partners LLC, American Arbitration Association – Deposition and Hearing before three judge panel

*BioMarin Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Duke University, United States Patent Trial and Appeal Board – Declaration and Testimony via Deposition

*Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc., United States Patent Trial and Appeal Board – Declaration and Testimony via Deposition

*GeoTag, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility, LLC et al., Federal Court – Northern District of Texas – Deposition

*Accusoft Corporation v. Quest Diagnostics, Inc. and Medplus, Inc., Federal Court – District of Massachusetts – Deposition

*Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp., United States Patent Trial and Appeal Board – Declaration and Testimony via Deposition

Stockholder Representatives for Interlace Medical, Inc. v. Hologic, Inc., Chancery Court for the State of Delaware – Deposition and Trial

*Adaptix, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Pantech Wireless, Inc., AT&T Mobility LLC, Verizon Wireless et al., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

*Adaptix, Inc. v. Apple, Inc., HTC Corporation, AT&T Mobility LLC, Verizon Wireless et al., Federal Court – Northern District of California – Deposition

*Adaptix, Inc. v. Ericsson, Inc., AT&T Mobility LLC, T-Mobile USA, Inc. et al., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

*Adaptix, Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc., AT&T Mobility LLC, Verizon Wireless, Sprint Spectrum LP et al., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition and Trial before Judge Schroeder

*Cell and Network Selection LLC v. ZTE (USA), Inc., MetroPCS Communications, Inc. et al., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

Glenridge Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Questcor Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Superior Court, Santa Clara County California – Deposition

* Denotes matter involving intellectual property

*Quiksilver, Inc. et al. v. Rox Volleyball, Inc. et al., Federal Court – Central District of California – Deposition and Trial before Judge Guilford

*U.S. Bancorp v. Solutran, Inc., United States Patent Trial and Appeal Board – Declaration and Testimony via Deposition

*EMC Corporation, et al. v. Zerto, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition and Trial before Judge Sleet

*Certain Consumer Electronics and Display Devices with Graphics Processing and Graphics Processing Units Therein, Investigation No. 337-TA-932, International Trade Commission – Deposition

*Certain Footwear Products, Investigation No. 337-TA-936, International Trade Commission – Deposition

*HSM Portfolio LLC and Technology Properties Limited, LLC, v. Micron Technology, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*Greatbatch, Inc. v. AVX, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition and Trial before Judge Stark

*Speedfit LLC v. Woodway, Inc., Federal Court – Eastern District of New York – Deposition

*Beverage Dispensing Solutions, LLC v. The Coca-Cola Company, Federal Court – District of Georgia – Deposition

*Callwave, Inc. v. Broadsoft, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*Callwave, Inc. v. Google, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*SNMPRI, Inc. v. Avaya, Inc., Federal Court – District of Delaware – Deposition

*Bombardier Recreational Products, Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc., Federal Court – District of Minnesota – Deposition and Trial before Judge Tunheim

*Brigham & Women's Hospital and Investors Bio-Tech LLC v. Perrigo, Inc., Federal Court – District of Massachusetts – Deposition and Trial before Judge Zobel

*AngleFix LLC v. Wright Medical Products, LLC, Federal Court – Western District of Tennessee – Deposition

*Cellular Communications Equipment LLC v. Apple Inc., AT&T Mobility LLC, Verizon Communications, Inc., Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Sprint Corporation, Sprint Solutions, Inc., Sprint Spectrum LP, Boost Mobile, LLC, T-Mobile USA, Inc., and T-Mobile US, Inc., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition and Trial before Judge Mitchell

*Cellular Communications Equipment LLC v. HTC Corporation, ZTE Corporation, Exedea, Inc., AT&T Mobility LLC, Cellco Partnership Inc. d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Sprint Solutions, Inc., Sprint Spectrum LP, Boost Mobile, LLC, T-Mobile USA, Inc., and T-Mobile US, Inc., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

* Denotes matter involving intellectual property

NaviSite, Inc. v. CareOne Management, LLC and Partners Pharmacy Services, Superior Court – Suffolk County Massachusetts – Deposition

Protect-A-Car Wash Systems, Inc. v. Car Wash Partners, Inc., MCW Inc., and John L. Lai, Federal Court – Northern District of Maryland – Deposition

NetScout Systems, Inc. v. Gartner, Inc., Superior Court – Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk, Connecticut – Deposition

*Solutran, Inc. v. U.S Bank et al., Federal Court – District of Minnesota – Deposition and Trial before Judge Nelson

*TPI, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc., Federal Court – District of Massachusetts – Deposition

*Certain Mobile and Portable Electronic Devices Incorporating Haptics (Including Smartphones and Laptops) and Components Thereof, Investigation No. 337-TA-1004/990, International Trade Commission – Deposition and Hearing before Chief Judge Bullock

*Certain Access Control Systems and Components Thereof, Investigation No. 337-TA-1016, International Trade Commission – Deposition and Hearing before Judge Pender

*Malibu Boats, LLC v. MasterCraft Boat Company, LLC, Federal Court – Eastern District of Tennessee – Deposition

*Chapco, Inc. and Samsara Fitness, LLC v. Woodway USA, Inc., Federal Court – District of Connecticut – Deposition

*Zoetis LLC et al. v. Roadrunner Pharmacy, Inc., Federal Court – District of New Jersey – Deposition

*IPS Group, Inc. v. Duncan Parking Solutions, Inc. et al., Federal Court – Southern District of California – Deposition

*Certain Hybrid Electric Vehicles and Components Thereof, Investigation No. 337-TA-1042, International Trade Commission – Deposition and Hearing before Judge Shaw

*Pacific Packaging Products, Inc. v. Packing Partners, LLC et al., Superior Court – Middlesex County Massachusetts – Deposition

In re Namenda Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation, Federal Court – Southern District of New York – Deposition

*Certain Dental Ceramics, Products Thereof, and Methods of Making the Same, Investigation No. 337-TA-1050, International Trade Commission – Deposition

*DSM IP Assets, B.V. et al. v. Lallemand Specialties, Inc. & Mascoma LLC, Federal Court – Western District of Wisconsin – Deposition and Trial before Judge Conley

*Cellular Communications Equipment LLC v. HTC Corporation, HTC America, Inc., ZTE (USA), Inc., Federal Court – Eastern District of Texas – Deposition

Concordia Pharmaceuticals Inc., S.À.R.L. v. Winder Laboratories, LLC, and Steven Pressman, Federal Court – Northern District of Georgia – Deposition

* Denotes matter involving intellectual property

*Eagle View Technologies, Inc. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., and Verisk Analytics, Inc., Federal Court – Northern District of New Jersey – Deposition

*Certain Color Intraoral Scanners and Related Hardware and Software, Investigation No. 337-TA-1091, International Trade Commission – Deposition and Hearing before Judge Cheney

*Certain Intraoral Scanners and Related Hardware and Software, Investigation No. 337-TA-1090, International Trade Commission – Deposition and Hearing before Judge Lord

America’s Test Kitchen Inc., as the Sole General Partner of America’s Test Kitchen Limited Partnership, v. Christopher Kimball, CPK Media, LLC, Melissa Baldino, Christine Gordon, Deborah Broide doing business as Deborah Broide Publicity, CPK Holdco, LLC and William Thorndike, Superior Court – Suffolk County Massachusetts – Deposition

REXA, Inc. v. Mark Vincent Chester and MEA Inc., Federal Court – Northern District of Illinois – Deposition

Malden Transportation, Inc. et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., Federal Court – District of Massachusetts – Deposition

Merck & Co., Inc. v. Merck KGaA, Federal Court – District of New Jersey – Deposition

Publications Within the Past Ten Years

“Evaluating Reasonable Royalties After ResQNet,” Philip Green, Rachel Hughey, IP Law360, Oct. 2010

“The 25% Rule is Dead – Now What?” Philip Green, Creighton G. Hoffman, IP Law360, Jan. 2011

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-001	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436	EV01552484	EV01552512		
PTX-002	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436 (with July 10, 2018 Certificate of Correction)	EV01553812	EV01553841		
PTX-003	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,170,840	EV01552513	EV01552558		
PTX-004	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,818,770	EV01552606	EV01552655		
PTX-005	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,825,454	EV01552656	EV01552705		
PTX-006	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 9,129,376	EV01552706	EV01552756		
PTX-007	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 9,135,737	EV01552757	EV01552807		
PTX-008	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436 (12/253,092)	EV056224	EV057433		
PTX-009	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,170,840 (12/467,244)	EV057435	EV058412		
PTX-010	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,209,152 (12/467,250)	EV058414	EV059396		
PTX-011	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,818,770 (13/438,288)	EV061359	EV066409		
PTX-012	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,825,454 (13/474,504)	EV066411	EV071523		
PTX-013	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,129,376 (14/449,045)	EV071693	EV072210		
PTX-014	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,135,737 (14/450,108)	EV072212	EV072667		

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-015	Certified Copy of U.S. Provisional No. 60/925,072	EV072669	EV072688		
PTX-016	Certified Copy of U.S. Provisional No. 61/197,904	EV072690	EV072758		
PTX-017	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 022176, Frame 0956	EV01552808	EV01552812		
PTX-018	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 024418, Frame 0134	EV01552813	EV01552817		
PTX-019	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 024479, Frame 0135	EV01552818	EV01552822		
PTX-020	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 028998, Frame 0573	EV01552823	EV01552827		
PTX-021	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 028998, Frame 0693	EV01552828	EV01552832		
PTX-022	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 034428, Frame 0032	EV01552833	EV01552837		
PTX-023	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 034428, Frame 0083	EV01552838	EV01552842		
PTX-024	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 036130, Frame 0873	EV01552843	EV01552866		
PTX-025	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 036130, Frame 0899	EV01552867	EV01552890		
PTX-026	Certified Copy of Assignment Reel 043955, Frame 0128	EV01552891	EV01552909		
PTX-027	2009 to 2012 Revenue Analysis Summary	EV01427937	EV01427937	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; S; 1002
PTX-028	Xactware Revenue Statement, as of October 31, 2017	XW00939981	XW00939981	Arnold Opening	
PTX-029	Xactware Revenue & Expense 2012-2017	XW00939979	XW00939979	Arnold Opening	
PTX-030	Amendment No. 4 to Liberty Mutual Satellite/Aerial Imagery Roof Services Agreement, July 24, 2009	EV01553686	EV01553688	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; I
PTX-031	Autodesk ImageModeler, August 16, 2000	EV01553472	EV01553473	Arnold Opening	A; F; H
PTX-032	Autodesk ImageModeler, February 16, 2009	EV01553474	EV01553475	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; X
PTX-033	Verisk Analytics NASDAQ Stock Page, https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/VRSK:US	EV01553842	EV01553847	Arnold Opening	A; C; D; F; H; R
PTX-034	Business Development Report, Xactware Monthly Business Review, February 18, 2015	XW00076080	XW00076084	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-035	Criterion Claim Service ClaimsReady Roof & Walls Report, October 12, 2012	EV751994	EV752009	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-036	Daga Declaration in Support of Eagle View's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, November 3, 2015	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-037	WITHDRAWN				
PTX-038	EagleView Measurement Performance Study	EV01553455	EV01553455	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; X
PTX-039	EagleView Presentation on FY2012 Discussion	EV437543	EV437601	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-040	EagleView Spread sheet on Georgia Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Companies FNOL Activity	EV551973	EV551973	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; S

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-041	EagleView Technologies Inc. Report on Fair Market Value of a Minority Common Stock Interest as of December 31, 2011, June 12, 2012	EV731108	EV731168	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; 105
PTX-042	EagleView Technologies, EagleView expands service offerings for contractors and insurance adjusters with new Economy Report, February 17, 2009	EV384267	EV384268	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-043	Email Chain from A. Godino to A. Barnum et. al re Upcoming portal updates, June 25, 2015	XW00034349	XW00034350	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-044	Email Chain from C. Johnson to K. Edwards re Fast 500 Revenue Cert form, June 23, 2015	EV725421	EV725422	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-045	Email Chain from C. Schnauffer to F. Giuffrida et. al re Recent competitor shopping, July 18, 2014	EV231620	EV231622	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I; BE
PTX-046	Email Chain from D. Schultz to A. Burch re Homesite Sales Pipeline, July 11, 2012	EV539832	EV539835	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; X
PTX-047	Email Chain from D. Schultz to R. Daga et. al re Report Number 11406893 Disputed Report, July 24, 2015	EV544187	EV544187	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-048	Email Chain from D. Tuttle to E. Webecke et. al re MetLife - Automated Peril Ordering, February 20, 2015	XW00087575	XW00087578	Arnold Opening	H; R; P; C
PTX-049	Email Chain from E. Valente to J. Lewis et. al re Amica and Roof Insight Pilot, September 1, 2015	XW00032535	XW00032540	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-050	Email Chain from J. Love to E. Webecke re EagleView Services, February 27, 2015	XW00087546	XW00087549	Arnold Opening	H; R; P; C
PTX-051	Email Chain from J. Polchin to M. Jenkins et. al re NDA, November 5, 2011	EV370320	EV370321	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; I; R
PTX-052	Email Chain from K. Loveland to W. Loveland re Xactimate Training, February 25, 2015	XW00075145	XW00075147	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-053	Email Chain from L. Salpini to J. Johnson et. al re EagleView Valuation, December 9, 2015	EV534536	EV534539	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; I; R; X
PTX-054	Email Chain from R. Daga to C. Barrow re Peril Based Ordering Issue, April 22, 2016	EV577923	EV577923	Arnold Opening	H; A; F; R; P; C
PTX-055	Email Chain from R. Daga to C. Hunt re LCPIC EagleView, September 26, 2013	EV0022620	EV0022621	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; X
PTX-056	Email Chain from R. Johnson to T. McKeon et. al re Auto Owners Roof Insight opportunity call	XW00101694	XW00101695	Arnold Opening	H; R; P; C
PTX-057	Email Chain from R. Natividad to D. Schultz et. al re Twister 1.0 Efficiency Gains Summary, December 1, 2014	EV499355	EV499355	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; I; R
PTX-058	Email Chain from R. Weinberg to K. Willems et. al re Rick Weinberg request, April 1, 2009	EV442480	EV442482	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-059	Email Chain from S. Parking to J. Taylor et. al re Xact Offerings/Information Needed, February 19, 2015	XW00046843	XW00046845	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-060	Email from B. Davis to J. Polchin re 2012 Board Discussion Materials, December 17, 2012	EV0012854	EV0012854	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; X
PTX-061	Email from C. Johnson to J. Merrill et. al re Eagle View Royalty March 2016, April 18, 2016	EV537828	EV537828	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-062	Email from M. Quilter to B. Brady re EagleView Board Deck 03, March 2016, February 23, 2016	EV538674	EV538769	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R;
PTX-063	Email from W. Raichle to R. Johnson et. al re EVT, March 27, 2016	XW00357862	XW00357864	Arnold Opening	H; P; R
PTX-064	Farmers Insurance Premium Report, August 27, 2010	EV046928	EV046940	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-065	FY 2014 Summary Revenue Analysis	EV01427938	EV01427938	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; S
PTX-066	FY 2015 Summary Revenue Analysis	EV01427936	EV01427936	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; S
PTX-067	Geomni Auto Owners Usage from May 1, 2017 to May 31, 2017	XW00941081	XW00941084	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-068	EagleView Measurements https://www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/	EV01553848	EV01553853	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-069	Risk Management Report, https://www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/other-measurement-products/risk-management-report/	EV01553854	EV01553861	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-070	Wall Report, https://www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/other-measurement-products/wall-report/	EV01553862	EV01553869	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-071	Gutter Report, https://www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/roof-products/gutterreport/	EV01553870	EV01553878	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-072	QuickSquares, https://www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/roof-products/quicksquares/	EV01553879	EV01553886	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-073	2018 Executive Summary & Fact Sheet, https://www.eagleview.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Corporate-Fact-Sheet.pdf	EV01553887	EV01553893	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-074	Geomni Home Page, https://www.geomni.net/	EV01553894	EV01553902	Arnold Opening	R; H
PTX-075	About Xactware, https://www.xactware.com/en-us/company/about/	EV01553903	EV01553904	Arnold Opening	R; H
PTX-076	EagleView and Xactware team up to revolutionize roof dimensioning, https://www.xactware.com/en-us/company/news/archives/2009/eagleview-and-xactware-team-up-to-revolutionize-roof-dimensioning/	EV01553905	EV01553906	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-077	Xactware AS, RI, and PI Locations	XW00942353	XW00942353	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-078	Master Product License Agreement between Xactware and Customers, March 1, 2011	XW00213278	XW00213300	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-079	Master Product License and Services Agreement between Xactware and Travelers, October 26, 2015	XW00940430	XW00940476	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-080	Master Services Agreement between Farmers Insurance and Eagle View Technology, March 1, 2018	EV01553689	EV01553731	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-081	Master Services, Software License, and Maintenance Agreement between Xactware and USAA, January 1, 2012	XW00418610	XW00418675	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-082	New Aerial Sketch Makes Drawing Roof Plans Faster and Easier, February 2012	XW00107107	XW00107108	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-083	Declaration of Chris Pershing in Support of United States Patent No. 8,078,436 Ex Parte Reexamination, October 24, 2013	EV032372	EV032398	[Pershing, Chris Ex. 15]; Arnold Opening; 1st Supp. Resp. to Rog. 13; Resp. to Rog. 22; Webecke Dep Kit	H; R; C; 701
PTX-084	PhotoModeler, PhotoModeler Standard Product Overview	EV01553476	EV01553478	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-085	PhotoModeler, PhotoModeler UAS Product Overview	EV01553479	EV01553480	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-086	Eagle View Roof Report Sales by Zipcode 2012-2017	EV01553383	EV01553383	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-087	Presentation by EagleView re EagleView Technology Corporation BOD Presentation, October 27, 2015	EV538890	EV539051	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-088	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Board Meeting June 15, 2009	EV442875	EV442923	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-089	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Board Meeting, March 17, 2010	EV052433	EV052493	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-090	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Board of Director's Meeting, January 18, 2011	EV054240	EV054279	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-091	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Corporate Review and Direction, December 15, 2010	EV053912	EV053963	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-092	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Management Presentation	EV634009	EV634056	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-093	Project Addendum between Xactware and USAA, August 19, 2013	XW00940714	XW00940718	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-094	EagleView Technologies Inc. Report Revenue P&L Analysis - Insurance (with 2009–2016 average selling price history)	EV01552476	EV01552477	Arnold Opening; [Quilter, Matthew Ex. 8]	A; F; H; S
PTX-095	AS, RI, PI Units (Jan. 2012 - Jan. 2018)	XW00942354	XW00942354	Arnold Opening	H; S; 1002
PTX-096	Roofers411 Home Page, May 29 2009	EV01553487	EV01553487	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-097	Skytek Imaging Diagram Pricing, Home Page	EV01553545	EV01553546	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; 105
PTX-098	Statement of Work No. 2 between Eagle View Technologies and Metropolitan Property & Casualty Insurance Company, January 30, 2012	EV549505	EV549508	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-099	Agreement for Mass Production Services between Geomni and SIGLA, December 1, 2017	XW00940340	XW00940349	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-100	Summary Revenue Analysis 2012 to 2015	EV534422	EV534422	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-101	Verisk Analytics 2012 Annual Report	XW00765000	XW00765148	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-102	Verisk Insurance Solutions, VIS Geospatial & Pricing Strategic Plan, September 2015	XW00024052	XW00024113	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-103	Xactimate's New Aerial Sketch Makes Drawing Roof Plans Fast and Easy, February 2012	XW00049804	XW00049805	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-104	Xactware Invoices -- "Xactware Invoices, May and June 2014"	XW00512746	XW00512761	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-105	Xactware Invoices -- "Xactware Invoices, August and September 2013"	XW00513134	XW00513152	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-106	Xactware Invoices -- "Xactware Invoices, October and November 2013"	XW00513010	XW00513066	Arnold Opening	H; R; 105; P; C
PTX-107	Xactware Monthly Business Review, April 24, 2014	XW00041055	XW00041108	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-108	Xactware Monthly Business Review, August 31, 2010	XW00281622	XW00281674	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-109	Xactware Monthly Business Review, August 31, 2011	XW00076415	XW00076487	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-110	Xactware Monthly Business Review, June 29, 2010	XW00280274	XW00280319	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-111	Xactware Monthly Business Review, March 20, 2015	XW00093504	XW00093564	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-112	Xactware Monthly Business Review, March 29, 2011	XW00284824	XW00284881	Arnold Opening	H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-113	Xactware Monthly Business Review, March 5, 2013	XW00048373	XW00048448	Arnold Opening	H; R; P; C
PTX-114	Xactware Monthly Business Review, November 30, 2012	XW00328662	XW00328733	Arnold Opening	H; R; P; C
PTX-115	Xactware Monthly Business Review, October 23, 2012	XW00238016	XW00238076	Arnold Opening	H; R; P; C
PTX-116	Description of Roof InSight	XW00016429	XW00016429	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-117	Eagle View Roof Report Zip Codes	EV01553677	EV01553677	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-118	Agreement between Xactware and Eagle View Technologies, November 3, 2008	EV732307	EV732317	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R; X
PTX-119	Amendment to Agreement between Xactware Solutions and Eagle View on November 3, 2008	EV414774	EV414775	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R; X
PTX-120	EagleView Technical Study: Hand Measurement vs. DIY Sketch vs EagleView, December 14, 2015	EV01553456	EV01553459	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-121	Eagle View ROI Analysis	EV551975	EV551975	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-122	EagleView Technology Corporation BOD Presentation, March 3, 2016	EV01503095	EV01503110	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-123	Email Chain from A. Drew to C. Barrow et. al re CNN Money One small company reinvents a \$30 billion market, December 16, 2011	EV448511	EV448512	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-124	Email Chain from C. Hunt to H. West et. al re Eagle View Pilot Review/Next Steps, February 27, 2015	EV551968	EV551969	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-125	Email Chain from T. VanSant to R. Daga re Xactimate Version 28	EV555925	EV555927	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R; P
PTX-126	Hand Measurements and DIY Sketching Tools Unable to Compete with Aerial Measurement Technology	EV01553384	EV01553386	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-127	EagleView PremiumReport, https://www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/roof-products/eagleview-premiumreport/	EV01553907	EV01553923	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-128	In the Matter of Verisk Analytics, Insurance Services Office, and EagleView Technology Corp, Docket No. 9363 Redacted Complaint	EV032008	EV032020	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	I; H; 105; R
PTX-129	Presentation by EagleView Technologies on Board Meeting, January 19, 2010	EV073143	EV073195	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-130	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Board Meeting, April 20, 2010	EV052644	EV052669	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-131	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Board Meeting, June 22, 2010	EV053095	EV053124	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-132	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Rating Agency Presentation, June 25, 2015	EV647324	EV647371	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-133	Presentation on Eagle View Measurements re Board Meeting, October 16, 2008	EV456906	EV456955	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-134	Services Agreement between Georgia Farm Bureau and Eagle View Technologies, March 16, 2012	EV551976	EV551977	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; A; F; R; P
PTX-135	Xactware Monthly Business Review, April 2012	XW00076687	XW00076768	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-136	Xactware Monthly Business Review, January 31, 2011	XW00281683	XW00281749	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-137	Xactware Monthly Business Review, June 22, 2011	XW00043693	XW00043764	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-138	Xactware Revenue Statement, as of December 31, 2017	XW00942356	XW00942356	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; 105
PTX-139	Aerial Imagery Questions, December 1, 2010	XW00284236	XW00284241	Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-140	Aerial Sketch Positioning and Pricing January 2012	XW00085872	XW00085873	Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-141	Arlen Pringle, The EagleView Technologies Website 4.1 Guide	EV023725	EV023770	Arnold Rebuttal	H; A; F; R; P
PTX-142	Barclays Equity Research, A deep dive on VRSK's EVT deal; May credit issuance and macro updates, June 4, 2014	EV560010	EV560053	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-143	Chris King, Roofing Contractor, State of the Industry Report, January 30, 2013	EV576140	EV567155	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-144	Commercial License Agreement between Pictometry and Xactware, December 15, 2009	XW00079998	XW00080005	Arnold Rebuttal	R; H; P
PTX-145	EagleView Technologies v. Aerialogics LLC, W. D. Wash. Case No. C12-6188RAJ, Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgement and Entry of a Permanent Injunction against Defendant Aerialogics and its Officers	EV034235	EV034242	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; P; R; H
PTX-146	EagleView Technologies v. RoofWalk Inc., Case No. C12-00544-RSL, Consent Decree and Dismissal	EV034797	EV034798	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; P; R; H
PTX-147	EagleView Technologies What Low-cost Roof Reports Really Cost Carriers	EV564980	EV564981	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; P; R; H
PTX-148	EagleView Technology Accuracy You Can Rely On. Guaranteed.	EV560380	EV560380	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; P; R; H
PTX-149	Eagle View Technology Corporation Board of Directors Presentation, October 27, 2015	EV01424840	EV01424916	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; P; R; H
PTX-150	EagleView, Take the Guesstimating out of Estimating, 2009	EV050189	EV050189	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; P; R; H
PTX-151	EagleView, Technology Provides a Precise Look at Roof Measuring, 2009	EV046647	EV046652	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; P; R; H
PTX-152	Email Chain from E. Webecke to C. Hopper et. al re Aerial Sketch, January 28, 2012	XW00324893	XW00324901	Arnold Rebuttal	R; H
PTX-153	Email Chain from E. Webecke to J. Loveland et. al re Proposed Price Changes, January 12, 2012	XW00089919	XW00089920	Arnold Rebuttal	R; H

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-154	Email Chain from J. Pawlik to J. Pelletier et. al re Xact Roof and Property Insight final data - EV decision, October 14, 2016	HARTFORD_001681	HARTFORD_001686	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; R; H
PTX-155	Email Chain from J. Taylor to C. Hopper re Aerial Sketch, February 8, 2012	XW00061079	XW00061095	Arnold Rebuttal	R; H
PTX-156	Email Chain from J. Taylor to E. Webecke et. al re Aerial Sketch v1 vs. v2 Demo, January 10, 2012	XW00060992	XW00060992	Arnold Rebuttal	R; H
PTX-157	Email Chain from P. Gamido to C. Barrow et. al re Travelers notes meeting, July 8, 2011	EV368795	EV368795	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; R; H
PTX-158	Email Chain from S. Stephenson to D. Cohen re Street reaction to the acquisition of EVT announcement, January 17, 2014	XW00358976	XW00358978	Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-159	Email from Xactware to E. Webecke re Xactware Webcast - Viewing Roofs in a Whole New Way with Roof InSight, August 15, 2013	XW00078716	XW00078717	Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-160	Fifth Amendment to Software License, Data Subscription and ASP Services Agreement between Hartford and Xactware, December 15, 2016	XW00940851	XW00940863	Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P; I
PTX-161	One small company reinvents a \$30 billion market, http://money.cnn.com/2011/12/09/smallbusiness/eagleview/index.htm	EV01548617	EV01548618	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R; P
PTX-162	Karen Edwards, Aerial Roof Measurements Technology Driving Changes to Professional Roofing Practices	EV00924222	EV00924226	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-163	Master Services Software License, and Maintenance Agreement between USAA and Xactware, January 1, 2012	XW00089641	XW00089706	Arnold Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-164	Presentation by EagleView re Executive Summary Presentation, May 2015	EV781030	EV781054	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; R; H
PTX-165	Presentation by USAA re Eagle View Measurements, September 24, 2008	USAA.1253	USAA.1270	Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal; [Allen, Michael Ex. 1]	A; F; R; H
PTX-166	Presentation from Xactware re Retreat 2011 - Xactimate SWOT Customer Prespective	XW00060775	XW00060788	Arnold Rebuttal	R; H
PTX-167	Property InSight/Roof InSight Main and Differentiating Features Draft	XW00357871	XW00357872	Arnold Rebuttal	P; R; H
PTX-168	Fourth Amendment to the Master Product License Agreement Effective January 1, 2011 Between Xactware Solutions Inc. and American Family Mutual Insurance Company	XW00940361	XW00940404	Arnold Rebuttal	P; R; H

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-169	Xactimate Version 27 Advertisement	XW00015967	XW00015978	Arnold Rebuttal	P; R; H
PTX-170	Xactware Monthly Business Review, December 15, 2011	XW00044368	XW00044441	Arnold Rebuttal	R; H
PTX-171	Geomni Monthly Actual Revenue & Expenses, 2012-2017	XW00942357	XW00942357	Arnold Rebuttal	S; H; P; C; R; 105
PTX-172	6th Amendment to the Software License, Data Subscription and ASP Services Agreement between Hartford and Xactware, September 1, 2017	HARTFORD_001765	HARTFORD_001766	Pawlik, Jason Ex. L	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-173	Collection of News Article regarding EagleView's Roofing Technology	EV01548609	EV01548647	Stevenson Opening; Steveson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; A; F; R
PTX-174	"Quick RoofShot Tutorial" (Feb. 5, 2015) (available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Ghy1s5lvu0&t=4s)	EV01553924	EV01553924	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-175	Eagle View Report (10331 E Broadway Dr, Miami Beach, FL 33154)	EV01550449	EV01550456	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-176	Xactware Instructional Video; Roofmode Video	XW00252589	XW00252589	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-177	Xactware Instructional Video; Sketchmode Video (Mass Production Tool)	XW00252590	XW00252590	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-178	Video 1 Showing Mass Production Tool's Roof Mode	XW00252591	XW00252591	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-179	Video 2 Showing Mass Production Tool's Roof Mode	XW00252595	XW00252595	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-180	Mass Production Tool Video_SketchMode Video	XW00252596	XW00252596	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-181	Aerial Sketch Summary Report, December 8, 2015	EV032052	EV032052	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; C; P; 1002
PTX-182	Xactware Instructional Video	XW00252712	XW00252712	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-183	Eagle View Report (3900 Forrest Crest Way, Louisville KY 40245)	EV01550440	EV01550448	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-184	Eagle View Report (3914 Buritt Way, La Cresenta, CA 91214)	EV01550463	EV01550467	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-185	Eagle View Report (6434 Maple Ave, Dallas TX, 75235)	EV01550434	EV01550439	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-186	809 N Canon Dr., Beverly Hills, CA Report	EV01550468	EV01550474	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-187	About Blom - Blom, http://blomasa.com/top-menu-en-0-1115/about-blom.html	EV01553925	EV01553925	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-188	Aerial Sketch 27.5 Category Summary Report, March 15, 2018	EV01553760	EV01553772	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-189	Aerial Sketch 28.0 Category Summary Report, March 15, 2018	EV01553773	EV01553785	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-190	Aerial Sketch Roof Creation Video	XW00116976	XW00116976	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-191	Xactware's Aerial Sketch Workflow Instructions	XW00049843	XW00049854	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R
PTX-192	Aerial Sketch Workflow Manual	XW00124216	XW00124233	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R
PTX-193	Agreement for Mass Production Services between Geomni and Weaverbird Engineering, May 1, 2016	XW00345994	XW00346000	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-194	All Biz, GeoPricing, https://www.allbiz.com/business/geopricing-877-708-4367	EV01553926	EV01553928	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-195	All projects except Interior Sensing and Property InSight (Sketch Tab and Reports)	XW00229644	XW00229644	Stevenson Opening	H; S; R; 1002
PTX-196	AssureCalc ConnectPoint Homepage, April 9, 2009	EV01553804	EV01553804	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-197	Astrium Geoservices Webpage, http://www.astrium-satcom.com	EV01553929	EV01553930	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-198	Blom3D 3D City Models	EV01552914	EV01552914	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-199	Blom3D 3D Modeling and Visualization	EV01552910	EV01552911	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-200	Blom3D Aerial Imagery	EV01552915	EV01552915	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-201	Blom3D Aerial Seabird Survey	EV01552916	EV01552917	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-202	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 1 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553809	EV01553809	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-203	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 2 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553738	EV01553738	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-204	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 3 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553739	EV01553739	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-205	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 4 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553740	EV01553740	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-206	Video Showing Mass Production Tool's Nested Roof Feature	XW00252518	XW00252518	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-207	Chapter 7: Introduction to Roof InSight, Retrieving Roof Dimensions and Characteristics	XW00041337	XW00041346	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-208	Files Embedded in Source Code	XW00253635	XW00253635	Stevenson Opening	S; H; P; C; R
PTX-209	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 1 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553745	EV01553745	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-210	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 2 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553746	EV01553746	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-211	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 3 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553747	EV01553747	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-212	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 4 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553748	EV01553748	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-213	Cyclomedia, "Who we are" (available at https://www.cyclomedia.com/us/profile-and-history)	EV01553931	EV01553935	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-214	Video 1 Demonstrating Aerial Sketch Use	XW00227634	XW00227634	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-215	Video 2 Demonstrating Aerial Sketch Use	XW00227635	XW00227635	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-216	Video 1 Demonstrating Mass Production Tool Use	XW00374872	XW00374872	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-217	Video 2 Demonstrating Mass Production Tool Use	XW00374871	XW00374871	Stevenson Opening	C; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-218	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 1 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553805	EV01553805	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-219	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 4 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553808	EV01553808	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-220	Digital Globe, "About Us", https://www.digitalglobe.com/about/our-company	EV01553936	EV01553943	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-221	Order of Dismissal, August 31, 2015, C12-618RAJ	EV01553944	EV01553944	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-222	Consent Decree and Dismissal, July 23, 2012, 2:12-CV-00544-RSL	EV01553945	EV01553946	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-223	EagleView Measurements Premium Report 23005	EV01550415	EV01550426	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-224	EagleView Measurements Premium Report 41645	EV01550427	EV01550433	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-225	EagleView Report Order 12542, July 30, 2008	EV01550475	EV01550481	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-226	EagleView Report Order 15142	EV01550408	EV01550414	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-227	EagleView Report Order 16479, September 3, 2008	EV01550522	EV01550528	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-228	EagleView Report Order 17689, September 15, 2008	EV01550496	EV01550507	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-229	EagleView Report Order 18350, September 17, 2008	EV01550508	EV01550514	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-273	Email Chain from M. Olson to E. Webecke et. al re Options for MP Partners Phase II contracts, short summary of each company, October 31, 2013	XW00053520	XW00053527	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-274	Email Chain from M. Olson to J. Taylor et. al re Friday, Oct 11th: Update on Data Acquisition and Mass Production, October 11, 2013	XW00225220	XW00225222	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-275	Email Chain from M. Olson to J. Taylor et. al re Training program, July 11, 2013	XW00325737	XW00325737	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-276	Email Chain from R. Mikkelsen to J. Lewis et. al re Training manual edits, October 22, 2013	XW00041331	XW00041336	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-277	Email Chain from R. Mikkelsen to R. Justus et. al re Beta Update, June 25, 2015	XW00034343	XW00034345	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-278	Email Chain from S. Stephenson to W. Raichle et. al re our negotiation, August 31, 2015	XW00358609	XW00358611	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-279	Email from Confluence to J. Lewis re Xactware Geospatial/Pricing Services>Infrastructure, January 19, 2016	XW00029702	XW00029705	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R
PTX-280	Email from D. Barrington to National Sales Team et. al re On-demand webcasts - most popular, August 7, 2015	XW00070900	XW00070900	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-281	Email from J. Aguilera to J. Taylor et. al re Discussion on Aerodata deliverables, October 26, 2012	XW00049099	XW00049103	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-282	Email from J. Lewis to J. Taylor re Video Demos, July 10, 2013	XW00374870	XW00374870	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-283	Email from J. Lewis to Pimgmt re Development status 3/1 - 3/7, March 7, 2014	XW00050575	XW00050580	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R
PTX-284	Email from J. Lewis to Pimgmt re Development status 3-22 - 3-28, March 28, 2014	XW00050505	XW00050508	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R
PTX-285	Email from M. Olson to J. Taylor et. al re Aerialogics vs. Eagleview - Patent review didn't go as EV planned..., April 29, 2013	XW00221145	XW00221145	Stevenson Opening	H; C; R
PTX-286	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 3 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553807	EV01553807	[Cohen, Geoff A. Ph.D. Ex. 4]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-287	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Board of Director's Meeting, March 22, 2012	EV450555	EV450605	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-288	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 1 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553750	EV01553750	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-289	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 2 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553751	EV01553751	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-290	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 3 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553752	EV01553752	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-291	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 4 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553753	EV01553753	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-292	Video of Dr. Stevenson Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 5 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553754	EV01553754	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-293	Document Describing and Showing Features of Xactware's Web Portal Chrome Extension	XW00036626	XW00036639	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-294	Video Showing Gambrel Roof Feature in Mass Production Tool	XW00252504	XW00252504	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; 1002
PTX-295	Aerial Sketch manual "Manually draw a roof in Aerial Sketch" (available at http://xactware.xactimate.archive.s3-website-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/english/help/cultureeng/html/mod/mod_manually_add_roof.htm .)	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening, [Allen Ex. 6]	A; F; C; H; R; X
PTX-296	Letter from C. Barrow to E. Webecke re Notice of Material Breach of November 4, 2008 Agreement, August 2, 2013	XW00077469	XW00077469	Stevenson Opening	H; R; P
PTX-297	Video Showing Mansard Roof Feature in Mass Production Tool	XW00252507	XW00252507	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-298	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 1 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553755	EV01553755	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-299	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 2 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553756	EV01553756	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-300	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 3 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553757	EV01553757	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-301	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 4 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553758	EV01553758	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-302	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 5 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553759	EV01553759	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-303	Master Product License Agreement between Xactware and Farmers, January 14, 2014	XW00078956	XW00079000	Stevenson Opening	H; R; F
PTX-304	Video Showing Use Roof Edit Feature in Mass Production Tool	XW00939859	XW00939859	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-305	Video Showing Use Roof Edit Feature With No Wall in Mass Production Tool	XW00252508	XW00252508	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-306	ibuildimagery's non-active website at http://www.ibuildimagery.com/ (Page Cannot Be Displayed)	EV01553947	EV01553948	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; C; R; X; D
PTX-307	Video Showing Pyramid Roof Feature in Mass Production Tool	XW00252547	XW00252547	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-308	Planet Labs — Approach "Aerospace know-how meets Silicon Valley ingenuity" (available at https://www.planet.com/company/approach/)	EV01553949	EV01553952	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; I; C; R; X
PTX-309	Premium Report Precise Aerial Measurement Report, September 26, 2014	EV846942	EV846952	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-310	Presentation by EagleView re Investor Presentation Initial Overview, November 2008	XW00351190	XW00351231	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-311	Presentation by EagleView Technologies re Board Meeting, January 19, 2010	EV051963	EV052019	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-312	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Xactware Solutions Quarterly Review (Q1 2012)	XW00081432	XW00081465	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-313	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Acquisition of EagleView Technology Corp., January 15, 2014	EV556789	EV556804	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-314	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Aerotriangulation, September 2015	XW00126602	XW00126626	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-315	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Project Aerial IC Discussion, May 1, 2012	XW00078365	XW00078392	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-316	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Xactware Solutions, Inc. Quarterly Review (Q2 2012)	XW00107375	XW00107414	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-317	Presentation by Verisk re Analytics Board of Directors Presentation, November 13, 2013	XW00374127	XW00374226	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-318	Presentation by Xactware re Aerial InSight Project, Status Update - Verisk Venture Capital, February 13, 2013	XW00215386	XW00215398	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-319	Presentation by Xactware re Aerial InSight Project, Status Update - Verisk Venture Capital, May 20, 2013	XW00215399	XW00215416	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-320	Presentation by Xactware re Aerial Sketch	XW00049869	XW00049881	Stevenson Opening	H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiffs Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-321	Presentation by Xactware re Property InSight Mass Production Tool Overview, July 2013	XW00253651	XW00253651	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-322	Presentation by Xactware re Property Insight Production Tool Version 3.0.0 - New RoofModel Technology	XW00181211	XW00181214	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-323	Presentation by Xactware re Xactimate online	XW00016970	XW00016985	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-324	Presentation from Verisk re Xactware Solutions 3Q2015 Review, October 23, 2015	XW00067152	XW00067193	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-325	Presentation from Xactware re Aerial Imagery Project Overview	XW00091060	XW00091096	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-326	Presentation from Xactware re Property InSight Instructions for Demo	XW00072045	XW00072053	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-327	Presentation from Xactware re Property InSight Mass Production Workflow Overview	XW00059958	XW00059967	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-328	Presentation from Xactware re Property Insight Production Tool User Guide - Demo 2, July 2013	XW00052029	XW00052038	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-329	Presentation from Xactware re Property Insight Production Tool User Guide - Demo 3, July 2013	XW00052039	XW00052053	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-330	Presentation from Xactware re Property Insight Production Tool User Guide - Demo 4, July 2013	XW00052054	XW00052068	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-331	Presentation from Xactware re Property Insight Production Tool User Guide - Demo 5, July 2013	XW00052069	XW00052080	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-332	Presentation from Xactware re Property Insight Production Tool User Guide - Demo 6, July 2013	XW00052081	XW00052100	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-333	Eagle View's Private Placement Memorandum to Potential Investors	XW00357031	XW00357054	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-334	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 2 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553741	EV01553741	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-335	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 1 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553742	EV01553742	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-336	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 3 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553743	EV01553743	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-337	Combined Video of Dr. Stevenson and Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 4 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553744	EV01553744	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-338	Property Insight Check Version 1.0, November 3, 2015	XW00067652	XW00067660	Stevenson Opening	H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-339	Property InSight FAQs	EV032093	EV032094	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-340	Property InSight Features	EV032095	EV032097	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-341	Property InSight Mass Production Draft, April 22, 2013	XW00224419	XW00224435	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-342	Property InSight Mass Production Software Status Report, April 26, 2013	XW00049015	XW00049030	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-343	Property InSight Mass Production Tool Installation Guide Version 1.0.0, 2013	XW00216843	XW00216849	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-344	Property InSight Mass Production Tool User Guide Version 1.0.0-Annex 2 Tutorial, 2013	XW00216763	XW00216784	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-345	Property InSight Mass Production Tool User Guide Version 1.0.0, 2013	XW00217085	XW00217128	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-346	Property InSight Mass Production Tool User Guide Version 1.1.2 Annex 1. Workflow, 2013	XW00253641	XW00253641	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-347	Video Showing Roof Movement Tool in Mass Production Tool	XW00036784	XW00036784	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-348	Property InSight Report 123 Wonderful St., Anytown, TX 12345	XW00661633	XW00661655	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-349	Property InSight-Mass Production Efficiency trends Version 1.0, July 28, 2015	XW00033756	XW00033775	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-350	PropertyInSight_KeynoteClipV3-7313 Video	XW00375562	XW00375562	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-351	Planet Labs, RapidEYE Imagery Product Specifications, v. 6.1, Jan. 2016, (available at https://www.planet.com/products/satellite-imagery/files/160625-RapidEye%20Image-Product-Specifications.pdf)	EV01553953	EV01554002	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; D; R; X
PTX-352	Report Change History	EV01550529	EV01550531	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-353	Video Showing "Reverse" Tool in Mass Production Tool	XW00252572	XW00252572	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-354	Roof InSight FAQs	EV032098	EV032099	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-355	Guide for Online Ordering of Roof InSight Roof Estimate Report	XW00008954	XW00008956	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-356	Roof InSight Report, April 27, 2015	EV033458	EV033462	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-357	Roof InSight Training Manual, May 6, 2013	XW00064999	XW00065023	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-358	Video Showing XY Movement Tool in Mass Production Tool	XW00252498	XW00252498	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-359	Video Showing Hip-Gable Conversion in Mass Production Tool	XW00252499	XW00252499	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-360	Video Showing Movement and Transform Tools in Mass Production Tool	XW00252588	XW00252588	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-361	Eagle View Roof Estimate Report for 1234 Main Street, Anytown, USA	EV01550623	EV01550628	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-362	Eagle View Roof Estimate Report for 14148 NE 190th Street, Woodinville, WA, 98072	EV01550629	EV01550629	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-363	Service Center Internal Roof InSight money back guarantee workflow Screenshots	XW00019782	XW00019782	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-364	Service Center July 17, 2014 Xactimate Desktop Release Notes Screenshots	XW00019783	XW00019783	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-365	Service Center Roof InSight Process Screenshots	XW00019780	XW00019780	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-366	Service Center Roof Measurement Provider Menu Order Screenshots	XW00019784	XW00019784	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-367	Video Demonstrating Aerial Sketch N-Side Roof Feature	XW00049732	XW00049732	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-368	Video Demonstrating New Aerial Sketch Features	XW00049735	XW00049735	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-369	Statistics - Movement	XW00942358	XW00942358	Stevenson Opening	H; R; 105
PTX-370	stats_epipolar	XW00942355	XW00942355	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-371	Spreadsheet of Tool Use Statistics From Postgres Database	XW00941300	XW00941300	Stevenson Opening	A; H; R; S
PTX-372	T. Fulford ltr. to B. Brown, February 22, 2018	EV01554003	EV01554005	Stevenson Opening	C; H; I; P; R
PTX-373	Video Showing Translation and Epipolar Movement Features in Mass Production Tool	XW00252516	XW00252516	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; 1002
PTX-374	Twister Version 2818.0 and Render House Screenshots	EV846816	EV846919	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R; 1002
PTX-375	United States Copyright Office Eagle View Roof Measurement Report, January 25, 2008	EV01550630	EV01550630	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R; X
PTX-376	WITHDRAWN				
PTX-377	WITHDRAWN				
PTX-378	Verisk Analytics Aerial Sketch Search Results	EV032082	EV032083	Stevenson Opening	A; F; R; H; C
PTX-379	Verisk Analytics Jim Loveland President Profile	EV032075	EV032075	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; C; R
PTX-380	Verisk Analytics Property InSight Search Results	EV032084	EV032085	Stevenson Opening	A; F; R; H; C
PTX-381	Verisk Analytics Roof InSight Search Results	EV032086	EV032087	Stevenson Opening	A; F; R; H; C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-382	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Requests for Admissions (Nos. 1-727), January 12, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening	H; C
PTX-383	What's New in Xactimate v28.0?	XW00100703	XW00100704	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-384	What's New in Xactimate Version 27.5	XW00019789	XW00019791	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-385	What's New in Xactimate, Roof and Property Insight	XW00019758	XW00019760	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-386	Xactimate 28 Aerial Sketch	XW00020137	XW00020160	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-387	Xactimate 28 Fundamentals & Proficiency	XW00029402	XW00029699	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-388	Xactimate 28 Introduction to Roof InSight	XW00020115	XW00020126	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-389	Xactimate 28 Level 1 Certification – Xactimate Fundamentals AdjusterTrainer Advertisement	EV032088	EV032089	Stevenson Opening	A; H; F; R
PTX-390	Xactimate 28 Level 1 Certification - Xactimate Fundamentals	XW00078640	XW00078641	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-391	Xactimate 28 Level 2 Certification - Xactimate Fundamentals	XW00078642	XW00078644	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-392	Xactimate 28 Level 3 Certification - Xactimate Fundamentals	XW00078645	XW00078647	Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-393	Screenshot of Aerial Sketch Use (1 of 7)	EV032047	EV032047	Stevenson Opening	A; H; F; R; C; P
PTX-394	Screenshot of Aerial Sketch Use (2 of 7)	EV032061	EV032061	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-395	Screenshot of Aerial Sketch Use (3 of 7)	EV032062	EV032062	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-396	Screenshot of Aerial Sketch Use (4 of 7)	EV032063	EV032063	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-397	Screenshot of Aerial Sketch Use (5 of 7)	EV032065	EV032065	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-398	Screenshot of Aerial Sketch Use (6 of 7)	EV032066	EV032066	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-399	Screenshot of Aerial Sketch Use (7 of 7)	EV032067	EV032067	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-400	Xactimate Sketch Estimate Screenshots	EV01427838	EV01427927	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-401	Xactimate Requirements	XW00100705	XW00100706	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; R
PTX-402	Xactimate Version 27 Lesson 3: Using the manual roofing tools	XW00009276	XW00009276	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R
PTX-403	Xactimate version 27 Lesson 4: Finshing the image	XW00009277	XW00009277	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-404	Xactimate version 28 System Requirements	EV032104	EV032108	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; R
PTX-405	Xactware Aerial Imagery Capture Specs v2.0, 2013	XW00049554	XW00049568	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R; C
PTX-406	Xactware Aerial Imagery Capture Specs v3.2, 2013	XW00222266	XW00222282	Stevenson Opening	F; R; H; C
PTX-407	Xactware Monthly Business Review, Dec 2012 – Jan 2013	XW00048232	XW00048289	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R
PTX-408	Xactware Price Sheet 12.1	XW00098832	XW00098832	Stevenson Opening	F; H; R; P
PTX-409	Xactware Product Review Dimensioning Roofs with Aerial Sketch Youtube Video	EV032126	EV032126	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-410	Xactware Market Intelligence Report	XW00752666	XW00752729	Stevenson Opening	F; P; H; R
PTX-411	Xactware Property Insight Features	EV031992	EV031994	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-412	Xactware Property InSight Mass Production Tool, User Guide Version 3.1.0, 2014	XW00127547	XW00127567	Stevenson Opening	C; F; P; H; R
PTX-413	Xactware Property InSight Report, August 28, 2015	XW00127812	XW00127821	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; R
PTX-414	Property InSight Roof Estimate Report for 5245 Willow Wood Drive, Abilene, TX 79606	XW00127873	XW00127873	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; R
PTX-415	Property InSight Roof Estimate Report for 1318 N 15th Street, Abilene, TX 79601	XW00127874	XW00127874	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; R
PTX-416	Xactware Roof Insight Features	EV031997	EV031998	Stevenson Opening	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-417	Xactware Roof InSight Report, September 18, 2013	XW00114187	XW00114191	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; R
PTX-418	Xactware Solutions, Inc. Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Requests for Admissions (Nos. 1-556), January 12, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening	H; C; R
PTX-419	Xactware Source Code	XWSC 054	XWSC 207	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; I; P; R
PTX-420	Xactware Source Code	XWSC 217	XWSC 346	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; I; P; R
PTX-421	Xactware Source Code	XWSC 366	XWSC 645	Stevenson Opening	C; F; H; I; P; R
PTX-422	Xactware Source Code Computer	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening	C; F; P; R
PTX-423	Xactware: Verisk Insurance Solutions Announces Expansion of Imagery Database, August 4, 2015	EV032079	EV032081	Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-424	File entitled "aerial-sketch.xml" - Description of Aerial Sketch	XW00019220	XW00019222	Stevenson Opening	A; F; C; R; X
PTX-425	File entitled "aerial-sketch-faq.xml" - Aerial Sketch Frequently Asked Questions	XW00019238	XW00019240	Stevenson Opening	A; F; C; R; X

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-426	FetchIncomplete Instructions	XW00035138	XW00035149	Stevenson Opening	A; C; F; H; P; R
PTX-427	GeneratePifAndReport	XW00035156	XW00035160	Stevenson Opening	A; C; F; H; P; R
PTX-428	Draft Aerial Sketch Workflow Manual	XW00116949	XW00116961	Stevenson Opening	A; C; F; H; P; R
PTX-429	Generated XML File	XW00662182	XW00662204	Stevenson Opening	A; C; F; H; P; R
PTX-430	Amendment No. 1 to Master Services Agreement between American Family Insurance and Eagle View Technologies, February 28, 2014	EV01553733	EV01553733	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A; H; F; R; I
PTX-431	Applicad Software and EagleView Technologies Partner for Metal Roofing Contracts, January 2011	EV047833	EV047834	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A; H; F; R
PTX-432	EagleView Competitive Analysis	EV073227	EV073273	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A; H; F; R; P
PTX-433	EagleView Technologies Competitive Analysis	EV386063	EV386109	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A. H; F; R; P
PTX-434	Email Chain from C. Barrow to H. Ellsworth et. al re Most Recent secret shopper, December 2, 2011	EV469398	EV469399	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A; F; H; I; P; R
PTX-435	Email Chain from D. Schultz to H. Ellsworth et. al re Remote Roof Reports with Competitor Email Responses, November 13, 2010	EV047436	EV047443	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-436	Email Chain from J. Lewis to J. Taylor re Goals and Strat docs, September 25, 2015	XW00023602	XW00023602	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-437	Email Chain from Z. Long to Contractor Support et. al re Comparison Reports, June 15, 2012	EV375843	EV375845	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A; H; F; R; P
PTX-438	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Xactware Solutions, Inc. Quarterly Review (Q1 2013)	XW00431832	XW00431866	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	F; H; R
PTX-439	SkyMeasure Roof Reports	EV01553508	EV01553523	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	A; H; F; R
PTX-440	Xactimate 27 Aerial Sketch Workbook	XW00019870	XW00019874	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	F; H; R
PTX-441	Xactware Monthly Business Review, January 29, 2012	XW00048296	XW00048366	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	F; H; R
PTX-442	Xactware Monthly Business Review, November 22, 2011	XW00110676	XW00110743	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	F; H; R
PTX-443	EagleView Technologies v. Aerialogics LLC, W. D. Wash. Case No. C12-6188RAJ, Order of Dismissal	EV034405	EV034405	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; P; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-444	Rick Weinberg, Eagle View Measurements revolutionizes the roofing industry with a unique innovation that saves roofing contractors time and money, November 11, 2016	EV01548693	EV01548700	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-445	Roof InSight Information	XW00016150	XW00016153	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-446	Xactware Property InSight "Learn About Structure"	XW00016183	XW00016226	Stevenson Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	F; H; P; R
PTX-447	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Third Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 23-25), February 15, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-448	All Produced Computers Running the Operational Software	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; C; F; P; R
PTX-449	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting EagleView Software Test (Part 5 of 5), March 29, 2018	EV01553749	EV01553749	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-450	Video of Dr. Stevenson's Computer Screen While Conducting Xactimate Software Test (Part 2 of 4), March 15, 2018	EV01553806	EV01553806	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; C; F; P; R
PTX-451	Eagle View Reference Guide: For Delivery Technicians 3-D Aerial Views of the Structure	EV000285	EV000341	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; R
PTX-452	Render House Reference Guide	EV000236	EV000269	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; R
PTX-453	Eagle View Reference Guide: Twister 3-D Aerial Views of the Structure, October 15, 2008	EV000144	EV000189	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; R
PTX-454	EagleView Premium Report RenderHouse, March 29, 2018	EV01553786	EV01553794	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; P; R
PTX-455	EagleView Premium Report Twister, March 29, 2018	EV01553795	EV01553803	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; P; R
PTX-456	Inventor's Journal, 2007 to Quarter 1 2008	EV000512	EV000556	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; C; R
PTX-457	Inventor's Journal, 2206 to end of 2006, August 2008 to January 2009	EV000451	EV000511	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; C; R
PTX-458	Inventor's Journal, Early to Mid 2008	EV000614	EV000663	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; C; R
PTX-459	Inventor's Journal, Mid to Late 2009	EV000807	EV000821	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; C; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-460	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 14-23), February 15, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-461	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 14-23), January 18, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-462	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Fifth Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-21), January 18, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-463	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Fourth Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-21), December 18, 2017	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-464	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 22), November 22, 2016	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-465	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 23-25), December 11, 2017	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-466	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-21), May 9, 2017	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-467	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 23-25), January 18, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-468	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Sixth Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-21), February 15, 2018	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-469	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-21), December 19, 2016	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-470	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 23-25), December 11, 2017	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R
PTX-471	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Third Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-21), September 1, 2017	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-472	Thomson Reuters Edited Transcript – Verisk Analytics Inc to Acquire EagleView Technology Corporation, January 15, 2014	EV01548660	EV01548683	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening	A; C; F; H; P; R
PTX-473	United States Patent No. 8,078,436 Ex Parte Reexamination File History	EV032127	EV033457	Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	
PTX-474	U.S. Provisional Appl. No. 12/364,506, February 2, 2009	XW00941700	XW00941972	Stevenson Rebuttal	
PTX-475	U.S. Provisional Appl. No. 61/025,431, February 1, 2008	XW00942096	XW00942209	Stevenson Rebuttal	
PTX-476	U.S. Provisional Appl. No. 61/047,086, April 22, 2008	XW00942210	XW00942268	Stevenson Rebuttal	
PTX-477	Document Describing Automation of Portions of EV Workflow	EV366804	EV366811	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-478	Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians 3-D Aerial Views of the Structure, June 12, 2008	EV000049	EV000083	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; R
PTX-479	Eagle View Source Code Computer	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; C; F; P; R
PTX-480	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 11), May 17, 2016, (IPR2016-00582)	EV01554006	EV01554071	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-481	Non-Instituted Decision (Paper 15), August 16, 2016, (IPR 2016-00582)	EV01554072	EV01554079	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-482	Second Corrected Petition (Paper 10), April 8, 2016, (IPR2016-00586)	EV01554080	EV01554141	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-483	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 11), May 17, 2016, (IPR2016-00586)	EV01554142	EV01554214	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-484	Non-Instituted Decision (Paper 15), August 16, 2016, (IPR2016-00586)	EV01554215	EV01554228	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-485	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 11), May 17, 2016, (IPR2016-00587)	EV01554229	EV01554232	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-486	Non-Instituted Decision (Paper 14), August 15, 2016, (IPR2016-00587)	EV01554233	EV01554245	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-487	Final Written Decision (Paper 43), August 14, 2017, (IPR2016-00589)	EV01554246	EV01554277	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-488	Corrected Petition (Paper 5), February 23, 2016, (IPR2016-00589)	EV01554278	EV01554324	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-489	Patent Owner's Response (Paper 30), November 14, 2016, (IPR2016-00590)	EV01554325	EV01554405	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-490	Final Written Decision (Paper 41), August 14, 2017 (IPR2016-00590)	EV01554406	EV01554426	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-491	Patent Owner's Response (Paper 31), November 16, 2016, (IPR 2016-00592)	EV01554427	EV01554508	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-492	Final Written Decision (Paper 50), August 25, 2017, (IPR2016-00592)	EV01554509	EV01554545	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-493	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 16), January 19, 2017, (IPR2016-01775)	EV01554546	EV01554620	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-494	Decision Denying Institution (Paper 21), April 18, 2017, (IPR2016-01775)	EV01554621	EV01554628	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-495	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 8), October 26, 2016 (IPR2017-00021)	EV01554629	EV01554704	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-496	Decision Denying Institution (Paper 9), April 14, 2017, (IPR2017-00021)	EV01554705	EV01554716	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-497	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 8), January 18, 2017, (IPR2017-00025)	EV01554717	EV01554793	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-498	Decision Denying Institution (Paper 9), April 13, 2017, (IPR2017-00025)	EV01554794	EV01554806	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-499	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 8), January 23, 2017, (IPR2017-00027)	EV01554807	EV01554883	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-500	Decision Denying Institution (Paper 9), April 19, 2017, (IPR2017-00027)	EV01554884	EV01554896	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-501	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 8), April 21, 2017, (IPR2017-00363)	EV01554897	EV01554971	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-502	Decision Denying Institution (Paper 9), July 18, 2017, (IPR2017-00363)	EV01554972	EV01555046	Stevenson Rebuttal	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-503	EagleView Technologies and Pictometry International Announce Merger, January 7, 2013	EV618404	EV618406	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; R
PTX-504	Email Chain from D. Schultz to C. Barrow re RenderHouse Update Procedure, October 21, 2008	EV043776	EV043777	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; R
PTX-505	Greentech Media, Struggling Sungevity Lays Off Workers after Merger Falls Through, February 18, 2017	EV01553423	EV01553425	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-506	Greentech Media, Sungevity Cuts Staff by Two-Thirds as Downward Spiral Continues, March 9, 2017	EV01553426	EV01553427	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-507	Greentech Media, Sungevity Declares Bankruptcy, Sells Assets, Gains up to \$20M to Continue 'Uninterrupted' Operations, March 14, 2017	EV01553432	EV01553433	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-508	Greentech Media, The Sungevity Saga: Is This Any Way to Run a Bankruptcy?, April 3, 2017	EV01553440	EV01553442	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-509	Inventor's Journal, 2008 to Early 2009	EV000557	EV000598	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; C; R
PTX-510	Inventor's Journal, Early 2008 Quarter 1 and 2	EV000599	EV000613	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; F; C; R
PTX-511	Jennifer Alsever, One small company reinvents a \$30 billion market, December 9, 2011	EV01548686	EV01548687	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-512	Markman Order Opinion, Dkt. 332, December 7, 2017	N/A	N/A	[Cohen, Geoff A. Ph.D. Ex. 7]; [Mundy Ph.D., Joseph 2018-06-22 Ex. 8]; Stevenson Rebuttal	P
PTX-513	Roof Consultants Utilize Aerial Measurement Technology to Provide Expert Service	EV01548688	EV01548692	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-514	San Francisco Chronicle, Dark cloud for workers, customers; Sungevity's bankruptcy filing creates uncertainty as Oakland solar company moves to reorganize; Sungevity's messy solar bankruptcy leaves customers on the hook, April 16, 2017	EV01553443	EV01553445	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-515	The Wall Street Journal, Sungevity Commences Chapter 11 Proceedings, March 14, 2017	EV01553430	EV01553431	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-516	The Wall Street Journal, Sungevity Hit with Lawsuit Over Mass Layoff; Suit against the home solar energy provider seeks pay and benefits for 300 people, March 14, 2017	EV01553434	EV01553435	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-517	United States Patent Application No. 12/148439 (U.S. 8,145,578 File History)	EV01548718	EV01549542	Stevenson Rebuttal	A; H; R; P
PTX-518	Xactware, EagleView and Xactware team up to revolutionize dimensioning, March 2, 2009	EV01548654	EV01548655	Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening	A; H; F; R
PTX-519	Email Chain from G. Willis to B. Holton et. al re Roofing Review, October 16, 2014	EV551970	EV551971	Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-520	John Tozzi, EagleView's Software Measures Rooftops with Photos from the Sky, December 8, 2011	EV01548684	EV01548685	Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; P; R
PTX-521	Xactware Webcasts: Viewing Roofs Whole New Way Roof InSight	XW00019263	XW00019263	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 11]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-522	Xatware Aerial Sketch 2 Hour Course Outline	XW00019861	XW00019862	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 12]; Stevenson Opening	A; C; F; H; P; R
PTX-523	Aerial Sketch-Manual	N/A	N/A	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 13]	A; F; H; R; P
PTX-524	Aerial Sketch Roof Estimate Report	XW00043891	XW00043895	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 14]; Stevenson Opening	H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-525	Aerial Sketch v.2, January 10, 2012	XW00043866	XW00043890	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 15]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-526	Email Chain from J. Loveland to M. Fulton re Quality and Org Chart and Summary, April 6, 2014	XW00110168	XW00110170	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 16]	H; R
PTX-527	Email from W. Raichle to M. Fulton et al. re Verisk/EVT, April 18, 2016	XW00357858	XW00357859	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 17]	R; P; C; H
PTX-528	Email Chain from W. Raichle to M. Fulton re SMC Agenda, April 13, 2015	XW00094995	XW00094997	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 18]	R; C; H
PTX-529	Email Chain from C. Hopper to M. Fulton et al. re EVT/PI package comparison, August 19, 2015	XW00115458	XW00115460	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 19]	R; P; C
PTX-530	Five Year Strategy Geospatial & Pricing Solutions, September 2015	XW00023603	XW00023664	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 4]; [Taylor, Jeff Ex. 16]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; P
PTX-531	Email Chain from M. Fulton to T. McKeon et. al re Eagle View setting, April 25, 2016	XW00345961	XW00345965	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 5]; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-532	Xactware Property Insight Product Marketing Plan 2015	XW00016132	XW00016141	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 6]; Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-533	Email Chain from J. Taylor to M. Fulton re Germania and Roof/Property InSight, May 21, 2016	XW00351032	XW00351033	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 7]	H; R
PTX-534	Email Chain from M. Fulton to R. Johnson re EVT sales talking points, July 15, 2016	XW00357620	XW00357620	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 8]; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-535	Verisk Analytics, Acquisition of EagleView Technology Corp, January 15, 2014	EV01548702	EV01548717	[Fulton, Mike Ex. 9]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R; P
PTX-536	Opportunity Assessment of Eagle View Technologies, May 9, 2012	XW00214588	XW00214600	[Green, Philip Ex. 3]; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R; I
PTX-537	Presentation by Verisk re Analytics Board of Directors Presentation, November 13, 2013	XW00361468	XW00361567	[Green, Philip Ex. 4]	R; P; C; H
PTX-538	MetLife EagleView Relationship Proposal, July 28, 2017	METRO-0000129	METRO-0000130	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 10]	A; F; H; R
PTX-539	Email Chain from Geomni Support to R. Young et. al re How do we order Geonomi Wall Reports, June 15, 2017	METRO-0002134	METRO-0002137	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 11]	A; F; H; R; C
PTX-540	Email Chain from D. Jettie to R. Young et. al re Automated Roof Reports, March 17, 2015	METRO-0002720	METRO-0002721	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 12]	A; F; H; R
PTX-541	Email Chain from R. Young to H. West et. al re EagleView Invoices and Pricing, December 15, 2016	METRO-0001975	METRO-0001977	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 13]	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-542	Sixth Amendment to Master Product License Agreement between Xactware Solutions and Metropolitan Property and Casualty Insurance Company, March 24, 2006	METRO-0001953	METRO-0001959	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 14]	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-543	Email Chain from E. Valente to M. Levin et. al re MetLife and Xactware Roof and Property Insight, November 29, 2016	METRO-0002213	METRO-0002216	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 15]	A; F; H; R
PTX-544	Email Chain from R. Young to G. Gunner et. al re Eagle View SOW, June 23, 2016	METRO-0000064	METRO-0000064	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 16]	A; F; H; R
PTX-545	Statement of Work No. 2 between Eagle View Technologies and Metropolitan Property & Casualty Insurance Company, January 30, 2012	METRO-0000065	METRO-0000068	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 17]	A; F; H; R
PTX-546	Email Chain from J. Das to M. Tori et. al re Property Insight Comparison Exterior Elevation Measurements, March 2, 2015	METRO-0002432	METRO-0002432	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 18]	A; F; H; R
PTX-547	Email Chain from R. Young to Geomni Support et. al re Geomni Report, June 13, 2017	METRO-0002346	METRO-0002348	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 19]	A; F; H; R
PTX-548	Statement of Work No. 3 Issued between MetLife and Eagle View, January 30, 2012	METRO-0003132	METRO-0003136	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 2]	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-549	EagleView - MetLife Executive Activity Summary	METRO-0003163	METRO-0004932	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 3]	A; F; H; R
PTX-550	Amendment No. 1 to Statement of Work No. 3, January 30, 2012	METRO-0002911	METRO-0002911	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 4]	A; F; H; R
PTX-551	3rd Addendum to Xactware Master Product License Agreement with MetLife	METRO-0002995	METRO-0003001	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 5]	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-552	MetLife Usage from June 1, 2017 to June 30, 2017	METRO-0002507	METRO-0002509	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 6]	A; F; H; R
PTX-553	Email from M. Tori to M. Levin et. al re Exterior Elevations Comparison, June 8, 2015	METRO-0002153	METRO-0002153	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 7]; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-554	Comparison of EV and Pictometry Reports	METRO-0002154	METRO-0002155	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 8]; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-555	Email Chain from R. Young to J. Hathaway re MetLife EagleView Relationship Proposal, July 31, 2017	METRO-0000128	METRO-0000128	[Levin, Matthew Ex. 9]	A; F; H; R
PTX-556	Aerial Sketch Mass Production, January 18, 2013	XW00113326	XW00113333	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 10]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-557	Property Insight Mass Production Tool User Guide - Version 3.1.0, 2014	XW00124978	XW00125129	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 11]; [Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 3]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-558	Email Chain from J. Lewis to D. Harris et al. re Pictometry Images can create automatic roof measurements, April 10, 2008	XW00302497	XW00302500	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 12]; [Taylor, Jeff Ex. 1]; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	R; P; C; H

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-559	Presentation from Xactware re Property Insight Mass Production Tool User Guide-Demo 1, July 2013	XW00052019	XW00052028	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 13]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-560	Property Insight Mass Production Tool - What's New?	N/A	N/A	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 14]	H; R
PTX-561	Geomni Data Package Client - What's New? Version 5.4	XW00939970	XW00939978	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 15]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-562	Email from J. Lewis to J. Taylor et. al re Eagle View Meeting/Info, December 9, 2008	XW00302472	XW00302472	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 3]	R; P; C; H
PTX-563	Email Chain from C. Pershing to J. Lewis et. al re Eagle View Agenda, January 9, 2009	XW00301677	XW00301678	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 4]	H; R
PTX-564	Email from W. Barnes to D. Luse et al. re Conference Call Agenda and attached Conference Call Agenda, July 15, 2009	XW00699757	XW00699758	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 6]	H; R
PTX-565	Email from W. Barnes to J. Keane et al. re EagleView/Xactware Integration Project Minutes, July 15, 2009	XW00699759	XW00699760	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 7]	H; R
PTX-566	Meeting Notification re Discuss what information Chuck knows about EVT	XW00040506	XW00040506	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 8]	R; P; C; H
PTX-567	Email Chain from J. Lewis to W. Wang et. al re R&D Position	XW00229533	XW00229536	[Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 9]	R; P; C; H
PTX-568	Email Chain from J. Loveland to E. Webecke et. al re EagleView and Xactware, August 3, 2010	XW00288969	XW00288978	[Loveland, James Ex. 1]	R; P; C; H
PTX-569	Email from J. Loveland to S. Stephenson et. al re Materials for Our Strategic Planning Session, October 13, 2014	XW00117056	XW00117056	[Loveland, James Ex. 10]	R; P; C; H
PTX-570	Xactware Global Presentation	XW00117104	XW00117136	[Loveland, James Ex. 11]	H; R
PTX-571	Email Chain from J. Loveland to E. Webecke re EagleView Xactware Agreement, September 4, 2012	XW00082757	XW00082758	[Loveland, James Ex. 2]	R; P; C; H
PTX-572	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Aerialogics, February 8, 2013	XW00078552	XW00078558	[Loveland, James Ex. 3]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	R; P; C; H
PTX-573	Email Chain from A. Boyman to J. Loveland et. al re Eagleview and RoofWalk Patent Infringement, April 5, 2012	XW00078362	XW00078363	[Loveland, James Ex. 4]	R; P; C; H
PTX-574	Email from J. Loveland to E. Webecke re EagleView, April 5, 2012	XW00117253	XW00117255	[Loveland, James Ex. 5]; Stevenson Opening; Webecke Dep Kit	R; P; C; H
PTX-575	Email Chain from E. Webecke to J. Loveland re Google Alert EagleView, December 8, 2011	XW00089626	XW00089627	[Loveland, James Ex. 6]; Stevenson Opening	R; P; C; H

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-576	Email Chain from J. Loveland to E. Webecke et. al re our negotiation, August 31, 2015	XW00241313	XW00241315	[Loveland, James Ex. 7]; Stevenson Opening	R; P; C; H
PTX-577	Email Chain from J. Loveland to A. Boyman et. al re Aerial Volume Updates, December 5, 2013	XW00241595	XW00241598	[Loveland, James Ex. 8]	H; R
PTX-578	Email Chain from J. Loveland to S. Stephenson et. al re Materials for our Strategic Planning Session, October 13, 2014	XW00109938	XW00109940	[Loveland, James Ex. 9]	H; R
PTX-579	Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,170,840	N/A	N/A	[Mundy Ph.D., Joseph 2018-06-22 Ex. 4]	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-580	Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,825,454	N/A	N/A	[Mundy Ph.D., Joseph 2018-06-22 Ex. 5]	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-581	Exhibit 1007 in IPR of U.S. Patent 8,170,840 Declaration of Harold Schuch	N/A	N/A	[Mundy Ph.D., Joseph 2018-06-22 Ex. 6]	R; P; C; MIL
PTX-582	Email Chain from A. Hanson to M. Olson et. al re Phrase for Consultancy Contract, July 5, 2012	XW00300017	XW00300026	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 1]	H; R
PTX-583	Email from M. Olson to J. Taylor et. al re First stab at analyzing Pictometry's patents and how these may affect Xactware, December 7, 2012	XW00221115	XW00221131	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 10]	H; R; P; C
PTX-584	Email Chain from M. Olson to J. Taylor et. al re Google Alert - Pictometry, August 2, 2012	XW00222868	XW00222869	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 11]; Stevenson Opening	H; R; P; C
PTX-585	Email Chain from J. Aguilera to M. Olson et. al re Google Alert - Pictometry, August 2, 2012	XW00222866	XW00222867	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 12]	H; R; P; C
PTX-586	Email from M. Olson and J. Taylor re Additional Revenue Streams Oct-12, October 2, 2012	XW00300117	XW00300124	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 13]	H; R
PTX-587	Email Chain from M. Olson to J. Lewis re RI-VS-EV Returns, July 2, 2015	XW00226038	XW00226039	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 14]	H; R
PTX-588	Email from M. Olson to J. Taylor et. al re Analysis of EVT Coverage	XW00039157	XW00039164	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 15]	H; R; P; C
PTX-589	Email Chain from M. Olson to D. Graff et. al re Mercury File NYC16955, Insured: Luis Teran, July 17, 2015	XW00226046	XW00226057	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 16]	H; R
PTX-590	Email Chain from M Olson to J. Taylor re Your Phone, July 10, 2012	XW00219685	XW00219686	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 17]	H; R
PTX-591	Presentation from Xactware re Property InSight Production Tool User Guide - Demo 1, October 2013	XW00051063	XW00051071	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 2]	H; R
PTX-592	Property InSight Mass Production Tool User Guide Version 3.1.0 - Annex 1 Workflow, 2014	XW00181263	XW00181271	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 4]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-593	Property InSight Mass Production Tool User Guide - Version 3.1.0 Annex 6 Roof Model, 2014	XW00124970	XW00124977	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 5]; Stevenson Opening	H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-594	Email Chain from D. Graff to A. Godino et. al re P1 inhouse Preliminary results	XW00067683	XW00067685	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 6]	H; R
PTX-595	Email from A. Godino to M. Olson et. al re Efficiency Trends Report, July 28, 2015	XW00033745	XW00033775	[Olson, Peter Magnus Ex. 7]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-596	Professional Service Agreement between Hartford and Eagle View Technologies, August 1, 2013	HARTFORD_000012	HARTFORD_000029	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. B]	A; F; H; R
PTX-597	Amendment No. 1 to Professional Service Agreement, August 1, 2016	HARTFORD_000001	HARTFORD_000004	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. C]	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-598	Amendment No. 2 to Professional Service Agreement, August 10, 2017	HARTFORD_000005	HARTFORD_000011	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. D]	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-599	Email from S. Parkin to K. Strychalski et. al re Roof InSight Pilot Agreement, December 7, 2015	HARTFORD_001115	HARTFORD_001117	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. E]	A; F; H; R
PTX-600	Verisk Pricing Proposal	HARTFORD_000492	HARTFORD_000504	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. F]	A; F; H; R
PTX-601	Email Chain from J. Lowry to J. Pawlik re Xact Roof and Property Insight, August 11, 2016	HARTFORD_001711	HARTFORD_001713	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. G]	A; F; H; R
PTX-602	Email Chain from J. Pawlik to S. McCauley et. al re Xactware Strategy, September 19, 2016	HARTFORD_001714	HARTFORD_001717	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. H]; Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-603	Email Chain from J. Pawlik to J. Pelletier re Xact Roof and Property Insight final data, October 21, 2016	HARTFORD_001704	HARTFORD_001710	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. I]; Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-604	Software License, Data Subscription and ASP Services Agreement between Hartford Fire Insurance Company and Xactware Inc., February 14, 2005	HARTFORD_001788	HARTFORD_001826	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. J]; Stevenson Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-605	Email from S. Parkin to J. Pelletier re The Hartford 5th Amendment, December 28, 2016	HARTFORD_000714	HARTFORD_000727	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. K]	A; F; H; R
PTX-606	Email Chain from J. Pawlik to J. Pelletier et. al re Geomni Aerial Imagery orders, August 29, 2017	HARTFORD_001679	HARTFORD_001680	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. M]	A; F; H; R
PTX-607	The Hartford Usage from 2/1/2017 to 2/28/2017	HARTFORD_001916	HARTFORD_001919	[Pawlik, Jason Ex. N]	A; F; H; R
PTX-608	Aerial Sketch Roof Property Requests from 2012 to 2017	XW00387511	XW00387511	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 11]; Arnold Opening	
PTX-609	Financial Report re Customers, 2011-2017	XW00938484	XW00938484	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 12]; Arnold Opening	
PTX-610	XW Aerial Sketch 2012 Monthly Actual Expense	N/A	N/A	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 13]; Arnold Opening	
PTX-611	Jeff Taylor's Aerial Imagery Notes	N/A	N/A	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 14]	
PTX-612	Agreement for Mass Production Services between Geomni and Vastech Corp., May 1, 2016	XW00345987	XW00345993	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 15]; Stevenson Opening	H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-613	Email Chain from K. Crandall to J. Taylor re Aerial Sketch Roof Reports	XW00114128	XW00114128	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 17]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-614	Email Chain from J. Taylor to D. Luse re Preliminary time scope of pictometry in XM8, June 30, 2010	XW00285428	XW00285433	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 18]	H; R
PTX-615	Email Chain from J. Taylor to J. Loveland et. al re Roofing Estimates in 2007, May 14, 2008	XW00356612	XW00356613	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 5]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-616	Email Chain from J. Lewis to C. Pershing et. al re Eagle View Agenda, January 7, 2009	XW00302467	XW00302468	[Taylor, Jeff Ex. 6]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-617	Email from J. Taylor to J. Loveland et. al re Roof Pictometry Internal Design Powerpoint, June 30, 2010	XW00285398	XW00285412	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 10]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	R; P; C; H
PTX-618	Presentation by Verisk Analytcs re Xacwater Solutions Quarterly Review (Q4 2011)	XW00082674	XW00082708	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 11]	H; R
PTX-619	Presentation by Verisk Analytcs re Xacwater Solutions Quarterly Review (Q1 2012)	XW00081468	XW00081501	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 12]; Stevenson Opening	R; P; C; H
PTX-620	Xactware Project Aerial "Market Intelligence Report" Property InSight Division perspective, Property InSight v0.7 2013	XW00055847	XW00055910	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 13]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-621	Email from E. Webecke to J. Loveland re EagleView FUD at Travelers, March 9, 2012	XW00394545	XW00394546	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 14]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-622	Email from E. Webecke to J. Loveland re Combined Project Overview and Update Jan 16 2013 and attached PowerPoint, January 16, 2013	XW00091059	XW00091096	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 15]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-623	Eagle View Technologies Opportunity Assessment, May 9, 2012	XW00090212	XW00090223	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 16]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; P; 105
PTX-624	Thomson Reuters Stretevents Edited Transcript Verisk Analytics Inc to Acquire EagleView Technology Corporation, January 15, 2014	XW00097336	XW00097359	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 17]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; R; P; C; H
PTX-625	Email Chain from C. Burt to M. Fulton et. al re Pictometry images can create automatic roof measurements, April 20, 2008	XW00302440	XW00302444	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 2]; [Fulton, Mike Ex. 10]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-626	Email Chain from J. Taylor to C. Burt et. al re Pictometry images can create automatic roof measurements, April 17, 2008	XW00356606	XW00356610	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 3]; [Taylor, Jeff Ex. 2]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-627	Email Chain from C. Hyland to J. Taylor et. al re Xactware - Eagle View research, May 7, 2008	XW00302391	XW00302393	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 4]; [Taylor, Jeff Ex. 4]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-628	Email Chain from K. Agrelius to David et. al re Thursday Meeting, April 23, 2008	XW00302421	XW00302422	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 5]; [Taylor, Jeff Ex. 3]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-629	Email Chain from C. Pershing to J. Taylor et. al re Sample data format, April 25, 2008	XW00302398	XW00302399	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 6]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-630	Email Chain from J. Taylor to R. Johnson et. al re Demo of Whitegold Solutions, May 7, 2008	XW00356611	XW00356611	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 7]; Stevenson Opening; Stevenson Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-631	Email Chain from B. Carroll to B. Jackman et. al re Eagle View, May 20, 2008	XW00301687	XW00301688	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 8]; Stevenson Opening; Arnold Opening; Arnold Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-632	Email Chain from C. Pershing to J. Taylor et. al re Thanks for visiting today, January 15, 2009	XW00301674	XW00301675	[Webecke, Edmund Ex. 9]; [Lewis, Jeffrey Ex. 5]; [Taylor, Jeff Ex. 7]; Stevenson Opening	H; R
PTX-633	Amended and Restated Project Addendum between USAA and Xactware, July 21, 2017	XW00940930	XW00940943	[Allen, Michael Ex. 2]	H; R; I
PTX-634	"Lidar 101: An Introduction to Lidar Technology, Data, and Applications," National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Coastal Services Center, November 2012	EV01555047	EV01555054	Stevenson Rebuttal	H; R
PTX-635	Exhibit 1a (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Unit Sales, Revenue, and Average Sales Price, Roof Report Sales to Insurers)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-636	Exhibit 1b (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Unit Sales, Revenue, and Average Sales Price, Roof Report Sales to Insurers and Contractors)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-637	Exhibit 2 of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Impact of Price Pressure from Geomni on Eagle View Roof Report Revenue)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-638	Exhibit 3a (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Lost Profits, Roof Reports Sales to Insurers)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-639	Exhibit 3b (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Lost Profits, Roof Reports Sales to Insurers and Contractors)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-640	Exhibit 4a (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Price Erosion, Roof Reports Sales to Insurers)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-641	Exhibit 4b of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Price Erosion, Roof Reports Sales to Insurers and Contractors)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-642	Exhibit 5a (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Total Lost Profits, Including Price Erosion, Roof Reports Sales to Insurers)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-643	Exhibit 5b (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Total Lost Profits, Including Price Erosion, Roof Reports Sales to Insurers and Contractors)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-644	Exhibit 6 (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Percentage of Roof Reports for which Eagle View Obtained Imagery from Other Sources, 2012 - 2017)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-645	Exhibit 7 (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Number of Geomni/Xactware Reports for which Eagle View has Coverage, 2012 - 2017)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-646	Exhibit 8 of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Eagle View Technologies, Inc., Summary of Contracts)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-647	Exhibit 9 of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Xactware Solutions, Inc., Summary of Contracts)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-648	Exhibit 10 (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Reasonable Royalty, Roof Report Sales to Insurers and Contractors)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-649	Exhibit 11 (Corrected) of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Value of the Patents-in-Suit Embedded in the Accused Products, Roof Report Sales to Insurers and Contractors)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-650	Appendix B of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Materials Considered List)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P
PTX-651	Appendix A of Jonathan Arnold Opening Expert Report (Curriculum Vitae of Jonathan Arnold)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Opening	H; C; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-652	Appendix C of Jonathan Arnold Rebuttal Expert Report (Materials Considered List)	N/A	N/A	Arnold Rebuttal	H; C; P
PTX-653	Exhibit A of Robert Stevenson Opening Expert Report (Curriculum Vitae of Robert Stevenson)	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening	H; C; P
PTX-654	Exhibit B of Robert Stevenson Opening Expert Report (Materials Considered List)	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Opening	H; C; P
PTX-655	Exhibit A of Robert Stevenson Rebuttal Expert Report (Materials Considered List)	N/A	N/A	Stevenson Rebuttal	H; C; P
PTX-656	Roofing Contractor 2013 State of the Industry, December 2013	EV556147	EV556221		A; F; H; R
PTX-657	Eagle View FY2013 Revenue Analysis	EV043428	EV043428	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; 105
PTX-658	Eagle View Sales Data 2016-2018	EV01553685	EV01553685	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-659	Pictometry International Corp., Eagleview Technologies Inc. Income Statement Jan. 2016 - Oct. 2017	EV01553466	EV01553466	Arnold Opening	A; H; F; R
PTX-660	Pictometry International Corp., Eagleview Technologies Inc. Income Statement Nov. 2017 - Feb. 2018	EV01553683	EV01553683	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-661	Schedule 1 pursuant to Section 1.2 Statement of Work of the Master Services Agreement between Eagle View Technologies Inc. and Allstate	EV811071	EV811075	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-662	Master Services Agreement between Eagle View Technologies Inc. and American Family effective as of February 28, 2014	EV657188	EV657221	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-663	Services Agreement between Eagle View Technologies Inc. and Crawford & Company, August 31, 2009	EV074192	EV074193	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-664	Master Services Agreement between Crawford and Company and EagleView Technologies, Inc., February 22, 2013	EV846323	EV846328	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-665	Services Agreement between Eagle View Technologies and the Hanover Insurance Company, September 1, 2010	EV816197	EV816211	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-666	Services Agreement between Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company and Eagle View Technologies Inc, July 24, 2009	EV363012	EV363027	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-667	Amendment 1 to Liberty Mutual Satellite/Aerial Imagery Roof Services Agreement between Liberty and Eagle View Technologies, March 15, 2012	EV547177	EV547189	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-668	Statement of Work No. 1 between Eagle View Technologies Inc and Metropolitan Property and Casualty Insurance Company, January 30, 2012	EV420644	EV420646	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-669	Master Services Agreement between Eagle View Technologies and Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company, February 1, 2009	EV790169	EV790181	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-670	Amendment to Order No. 2 between Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company and Eagle View Technologies Inc., August 1, 2012	EV839087	EV839089	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-671	Amendment No. 3 to Order No. 2 between Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company and Eagle View Technologies, February 22, 2013	EV790182	EV790182	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-672	Amendment No. 6 to Order No. 2 between Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company and Eagle View Technologies Inc., January 31, 2017	EV01553810	EV01553811	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-673	Work Order between Eagle View Technologies Inc. and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company	EV432701	EV432758	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-674	Master Services Agreement between Travelers Insurance and EagleView Technologies Inc, July 1, 2011	EV368614	EV368620	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-675	Statement of Work between USAA and Eagle View, January 2010	USAA.1548	USAA.1558	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-676	Amendment No. 2 to Master Product License and Service Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Allstate Insurance Company, May 3, 2010	XW00213949	XW00213954	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-677	Amendment to Xactware Product License Summary between Xactware Solutions Inc. and American Integrity Insurance, December 1, 2011	XW00513007	XW00513008	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-678	Master Product License Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Amica Mutual Insurance Company, January 1, 2013	XW00099949	XW00099978	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-679	Second Amendment to Master Product License Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc, Interinsurance Exchange of the Automobile Club, Auto Club County Mutual Insurance Company, Automobile Club of Missouri and Auto Club Family Insurance Company, March 1, 2014	XW00940354	XW00940360	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-680	Fourth Amendment to Master Product License Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Church Mutual Insurance Company, January 1, 2011	XW00940405	XW00940411	Arnold Opening	H; R; I

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-681	Eighth Amendment to Master Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Crawford and Company, October 1, 2017	XW00940412	XW00940418	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-682	Master Product License Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Farmers Insurance Exchange, January 14, 2014	XW00077473	XW00077524	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-683	Fourth Amendment to the Master Product License Agreement between Farmers Insurance Exchange and Xactware Solutions Inc., December 11, 2015	XW00438158	XW00438159	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-684	Fifth Amendment to Master Product License Agreement between Farmers Insurance Exchange and Xactware Solutions Inc., June 2, 2016	XW00342770	XW00342771	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-685	Sixth Amendment to Software License, Data Subscription and ASP Services Agreement between Hartford Fire Insurance Company and Xactware Solutions Inc., February 14, 2005	XW00940794	XW00940795	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-686	Fourth Amendment to Master Product License Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Kemper Corporate Services Inc., October 4, 2005	XW00940419	XW00940427	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-687	Amendment to Xactware Product License Summary between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Rockford Mutual Insurance Company, February 1, 2015	XW00448243		Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-688	Third Amendment to Xactware Product License Summary between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Rockford Mutual Insurance Company, February 1, 2015	XW00448197	XW00448198	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-689	Master Software Subscription Agreement between State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company and Xactware Solutions	XW00080492	XW00080505	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R; I
PTX-690	Master Product License and Services Agreement Schedule 3 between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Travelers Indemnity Company, March 1, 2012	XW00940428	XW00940429	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-691	Master Product License and Services Agreement between Xactware Solutions Inc. and Travelers Indemnity Company, October 26, 2015	XW00239427	XW00239473	Arnold Opening	H; R
PTX-692	Amendment No. 01 to Project Addendum between Xactware Solutions Inc. and United Services Automobile Association, August 24, 2013	XW00940694	XW00940694	Arnold Opening	H; R; I

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiffs Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-693	Amendment No. 3 to Project Addendum between Xactware Solutions Inc. and United Services Automobile Association, March 24, 2014	XW00940688	XW00940688	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-694	Project Addendum between Xactware Solutions and United Services Automobile Association, March 23, 2015	XW00941067	XW00941078	Arnold Opening	H; R; I
PTX-695	Patent Owner's Response (Paper 31), November 14, 2016, (IPR2016-00589)	EV01555055	EV01555128		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-696	Petitioner's Reply, February 6, 2017, (IPR2016-00589)	EV01555129	EV01555158		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-697	Petition (Paper 1), February 8, 2016, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555159	EV01555203		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-698	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 7), June 2, 2016, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555204	EV01555245		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-699	Institution Decision (Paper 13), August 31, 2016, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555246	EV01555259		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-700	Patent Owner's Response (Paper 31), November 16, 2016, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555260	EV01555297		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-701	Petitioner's Reply, January 27, 2017, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555298	EV01555332		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-702	Final Written Decision (Paper 45), August 28, 2017, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555333	EV01555340		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-703	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 7), June 2, 2016, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555341	EV01555382		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-704	Institution Decision (Paper 13), August 31, 2016, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555383	EV01555396		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-705	Final Written Decision (Paper 45), August 24, 2017, (IPR2016-00593)	EV01555397	EV01555404		R; P; C; MIL
PTX-706	Verisk's Responses to Eagle View's First Set of Requests for Admission, January 12, 2018	N/A	N/A		H; P; C
PTX-707	Xactware's Responses to Eagle View's First Set of Requests for Admission, January 12, 2018	N/A	N/A		H; P; C
PTX-708	EagleView Technology Corporation and Subsidiaries Consolidated Financial Statements 2013-2014	EV725469	EV725498		A; F; H; R
PTX-709	Pictometry International Corporation Consolidated Financial Statements 2011-2012	EV725444	EV725468		A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-710	Eagle View Technologies Incorporated Consolidated Financial Statements 2011-2012	EV725423	EV725443		A; F; H; R
PTX-711	Pictometry International Corp Consolidated Financial Statements 2011-2012	EV534611	EV534635		A; F; H; R
PTX-712	WITHDRAWN				
PTX-713	Eagle View Technologies Inc Consolidated Financial Statements 2011-2012	EV534853	EV534873		A; F; H; R
PTX-714	Eagle View Technologies Financial Statements 2008-2009	EV370322	EV370337		A; F; H; R
PTX-715	Eagle View Technologies Financial Statements 2009-2010	EV370338	EV370353		A; F; H; R
PTX-716	Eagle View Board Meeting Presentation, Sept. 7, 2010	EV053567	EV053610		A; F; H; R
PTX-717	Email from C. Barrow to D. Schultz re Bloomberg Article, December 9, 2011	EV469560	EV469562		A; F; H; R
PTX-718	Eagle View Board of Directors Presentation, March 3, 2016	EV536802	EV536906		A; F; H; R
PTX-719	Eagle View and GAF Materials Corp. Strategic Alliance Term Sheet	EV546163	EV546166		A; F; H; R
PTX-720	Eagle View Marketing Material	EV563522	EV563523	Arnold Rebuttal	A; F; H; R
PTX-721	Adjuster Feedback on Eagle View	EV551972	EV551972		A; F; H; R
PTX-722	Georgia Farm Bureau Pilot Detail, July 17, 2013	EV551974	EV551974		A; F; H; R
PTX-723	Email Chain from J. Lewis to B. Allphin et. al re Multiple Buildings - Eagleview vs Roofing Insight, March 28, 2014	XW00050509	XW00050510		H; R; P
PTX-724	Email Chain from A. Boyman to S. Stephenson et. al re Presentation Materials, March 19, 2012	XW00078307	XW00078307		H; R; P
PTX-725	Email from E. Webecke to E. Webecke re Temp File	XW00088753	XW00088755		H; R; P
PTX-726	Presentation by DavisPolk re Verisk Analytics and EagleView Technology Corp. PMN No. 2014-0496 Confidential Presentation to the Federal Trade Commission	XW00214718	XW00214747		H; R; P
PTX-727	The Hartford Usage from 3/1/2017 to 3/31/2017	HARTFORD_001920	HARTFORD_001922		A; F; H; R
PTX-728	The Hartford Usage from 4/1/2017 to 4/30/2017	XW00941639	XW00941642		H; R
PTX-729	The Hartford Usage from 5/1/2017 to 5/31/2017	XW00941646	XW00941649		H; R
PTX-730	The Hartford Usage from 6/1/2017 to 6/30/2017	XW00941653	XW00941656		H; R
PTX-731	The Hartford Usage for 7/2017	XW00941660	XW00941662		H; R
PTX-732	The Hartford Usage for 8/2017	XW00941666	XW00941668		H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-733	The Hartford Usage for 9/2017	XW00941672	XW00941674		H; R
PTX-734	The Hartford Usage for 10/2017	XW00941678	XW00941680		H; R
PTX-735	The Hartford Usage for 11/2017	XW00941684	XW00941687		H; R
PTX-736	The Hartford Usage for 12/2017	XW00941692	XW00941695		H; R
PTX-737	Auto Owners Usage from 6/1/2017 to 6/30/2017	XW00941088	XW00941091		H; R
PTX-738	Auto Owners Usage for 7/2017	XW00941095	XW00941098		H; R
PTX-739	Citizens Property Insurance Usage for 9/2017	XW00941102	XW00941105		H; R
PTX-740	Citizens Property Insurance Usage for 10/2017	XW00941110	XW00941113		H; R
PTX-741	Citizens Property Insurance Usage for 11/2017	XW00941118	XW00941121		H; R
PTX-742	Citizens Property Insurance Usage for 12/2017	XW00941126	XW00941130		H; R
PTX-743	Kemper Usage from 2/1/2017 to 2/28/2017	XW00941301	XW00941304		H; R
PTX-744	Kemper Usage from 3/1/2017 to 3/31/2017	XW00941308	XW00941311		H; R
PTX-745	Kemper Usage from 4/1/2017 to 4/30/2017	XW00941316	XW00941319		H; R
PTX-746	Kemper Usage from 5/1/2017 to 5/31/2017	XW00941324	XW00941327		H; R
PTX-747	Kemper Usage from 6/1/2017 to 6/30/2017	XW00941332	XW00941335		H; R
PTX-748	Kemper Usage for 7/2017	XW00941340	XW00941343		H; R
PTX-749	Kemper Usage for 8/2017	XW00941348	XW00941351		H; R
PTX-750	Kemper Usage for 9/2017	XW00941356	XW00941359		H; R
PTX-751	Kemper Usage for 10/2017	XW00941364	XW00941367		H; R
PTX-752	Kemper Usage for 11/2017	XW00941385	XW00941388		H; R
PTX-753	Kemper Usage for 12/2017	XW00941402	XW00941406		H; R
PTX-754	MetLife Usage from 4/1/2017 to 4/30/2017	XW00941559	XW00941562		H; R
PTX-755	MetLife Usage from 5/1/2017 to 5/31/2017	XW00941566	XW00941569		H; R
PTX-756	MetLife Usage for 7/2017	XW00941580	XW00941583		H; R
PTX-757	MetLife Usage for 8/2017	XW00941587	XW00941589		H; R
PTX-758	MetLife Usage for 9/2017	XW00941595	XW00941599		H; R
PTX-759	MetLife Usage for 10/2017	XW00941606	XW00941610		H; R
PTX-760	MetLife Usage for 11/2017	XW00941617	XW00941621		H; R
PTX-761	MetLife Usage for 12/2017	XW00941628	XW00941631		H; R
PTX-762	EagleView Technologies Inc. Report on Fair Market Value of a Minority Common Stock Interest as of September 30, 2011, June 12, 2012	EV421349	EV421408		A; F; H; R
PTX-763	EagleView Technologies Inc. Report on Fair Market Value of a Minority Common Stock Interest as of December 31, 2012, May 7, 2013	EV423659	EV423726		A; F; H; R; D
PTX-764	EagleView Technologies Inc. Report on Fair Market Value of a Minority Common Stock Interest as of December 31, 2012, June 11, 2013	EV799072	EV799140		A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-765	EagleView Technologies Inc. Report on Fair Value of Certain Identifiable Intangible Assets of SuperBuild, LLC as of October 27, 2011, June 12, 2012	EV421285	EV421348		A; F; H; R
PTX-766	EagleView Technology Corporation Valuation of a Minority, Non-marketable Common Stock Interest as of January 7, 2013, Schedule 1	EV723969	EV723982		A; F; H; R; I
PTX-767	EagleView Technology Corporation Valuation of a Mintory Common Stock Interest as of August 31, 2013, April 15, 2013	EV723983	EV724034		A; F; H; R
PTX-768	EagleView Technology Corporation Valuation of a Mintory Common Stock Interest as of December 31, 2014, April 15, 2015	EV724035	EV724090		A; F; H; R
PTX-769	EagleView Technology Corporation Valuation of a Mintory Common Stock Interest as of April 30, 2014, April 15, 2015	EV724091	EV724148		A; F; H; R
PTX-770	Phoenix Topco, Inc. (dba Eagle View Technologies) July 15, 2015 Stock Options Valuation, January 18, 2016	EV537017	EV537045		A; F; H; R
PTX-771	Eagle View Technologies, Inc. Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, and Independent Auditors' Report	EV840218	EV840236		A; F; H; R
PTX-772	United States Patent No. 9,679,227	EV01555405	EV01555448		R; P
PTX-773	Email Chain from J. Taylor to Z. Smith et. al re Meeting with Pictometry, January 30, 2012	XW00049771	XW00049777		H; R; P
PTX-774	Email Chain from J. Lewis to E. Webecke et. al re Roof comparison, September 13, 2013	XW00051574	XW00051575		H; R
PTX-775	Email from J. Taylor to E. Webecke et. al re Market Intel Report - PI perspective, November 22, 2013	XW00058861	XW00058861		H; R
PTX-776	Project Aerial Market Intelligence Report, Property InSight v0.7, 2013	XW00058862	XW00058925		H; R
PTX-777	Email Chain from M. Anquillaire to A. Boyman et. al re Aerial Volume Updates, December 5, 2013	XW00078266	XW00078267		H; R
PTX-778	Email Chain from J. Taylor to J. Lewis et. al re Google Alert - Pictometry, August 2, 2012	XW00222870	XW00222870		H; R; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-779	Email Chain from S. Stephenson to S. Sutton re Liberty Mutual Strategic Partnership, January 31, 2014	XW00358842	XW00358845		H; R; P
PTX-780	Email chain from M. Olson to J. Taylor et. al re Requesting a review of imagery and its future, June 19, 2014	XW00042387	XW00042391		H; R; P
PTX-781	Email Chain from A. Zickell to E. Webecke re Off the wall thought, October 24, 2013	XW00077360	XW00077366		H; R; P
PTX-782	Email from E. Webecke to J. Loveland re Verisk Ventures, January 15, 2013	XW00091011	XW00091011		H; R
PTX-783	Email from S. Alvarez to S. Stephenson et. al re Verisk Venture Capitalists - Aerial Imagery, January 16, 2013	XW00108092	XW00108092		H; R
PTX-784	Presentation by Xactware re Aerial Imagery Project Overview	XW00108093	XW00108129		P; F
PTX-785	Aerial Sketch Mass Productions Options & Recommendations, 2012	XW00222900	XW00222910		P; R; H; C
PTX-786	Aerial Image Design Changes, January 10, 2010	XW00752776	XW00752798		P; R; A; F; H
PTX-787	Email from Andrew Zickell to Webecke re <i>Walker Process</i> claims against EV	XW00237429	XW00237433		H; R; P
PTX-788	Email Chain from J. David to M. Olson et. al re Patent Search, August 15, 2012	XW00402509	XW00402510		A; F; R; H; P
PTX-789	Email Chain from M. Olson to J. Aguilera et. al re Property InSight Production Software - State of the Nation on April 24th, April 24, 2013	XW00224397	XW00224401		P; H; R
PTX-790	Email from J. Taylor to ASIS et. al re InSight (Roof & Property), January 31, 2013	XW00223043	XW00223043		P; H; R
PTX-791	Email chain from M. Olson to J. Taylor re Aerial-InSight status update 3-12-2013, March 12, 2013	XW00224630	XW00224630		P; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-792	Email from D. Graff to A. Godino et. al 5 minute QC process, November 13, 2015	XW00067668	XW00067669		P; H; R
PTX-793	Email from M. Olson to PI management team re Tuesday, April 29th, 2014: Update on Data Acquisition, Mass Production and Geoserver coverage, April 29, 2014	XW00048128	XW00048131		H; R
PTX-794	Email Chain from J. Taylor to M. Olson re Update, December 4, 2012	XW00111453	XW00111455		P; H; R
PTX-795	Email Chain from A. Cobo to J. Lewis et. al re Videos of our Aerial Sketch comparison times, February 23, 2015	XW00039931	XW00039936		H; R
PTX-796	Agreement for Services between Xactware Solutions Inc. and AMS Geomatics S.I., August 1, 2012	XW00090357	XW00090367		H; R
PTX-797	Presentation re Property Insight Roof Tools 3.5.0, May 2015	XW00124800	XW00124853		A; F; H; R
PTX-798	Property Insight Mass Production Tool What's New Version 3.1.0, 2014	XW00124907	XW00124932		H; R
PTX-799	Property Insight MPT What's New Version 3.1.0, January 14, 2016	XW00253658	XW00253658		A; F; H; R
PTX-800	Email Chain from I. Aguilera to J. Lewis et. al re March 13th, 2015 Report, March 13, 2015	XW00312536	XW00312562		H; R
PTX-801	Presentation by Xactware re Roof InSight	XW00016347	XW00016377		H; R
PTX-802	Email Chain from J. Lewis to A. Godino re Sample_Data.zip, July 12, 2016	XW00335978	XW00335981		R; P; H
PTX-803	Email Chain from M. Maroto to A. Barnum et. al re Portal Code Conversion, June 16, 2015	XW00679569	XW007679573		H; R
PTX-804	Email Chain from J. Lewis to J. Taylor re ROOF INSIGHT QUESTION - FW: 5008-15-4099 - Site Map and price for "The Vineyards", May 15, 2015	XW00027692	XW00027695		H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-805	Olson email to Lewis stating XW should sign over EV customers, but it's harder for EV to take business from XW	XW00034237	XW00034238		R; P; H
PTX-806	Xactware Preproduction of Texas Key Ideas & Plan Version 0.9, January 11, 2016	XW00029166	XW00029180		R; H; A; F
PTX-807	Email from Loveland to XW executives forwarding CNNMoney and Bloomberg articles praising EV	XW00044301	XW00044304		P; F; H; A
PTX-808	State Farm and Eagle View presentation, June 1, 2011	EV054540	EV054560	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-809	EagleView Technologies Premium Report, September 27, 2013	EV00847349	EV00847360		A; F; H; R
PTX-810	EagleView Technologies Solar Report, October 17, 2013	EV00847451	EV00847467		A; F; H; R
PTX-811	EagleView Technologies WallsLite Report, March 26, 2015	EV01484160	EV01484165		A; F; H; R
PTX-812	EagleView Technologies All Seeing Renovations Precise Aerial Measurement Report	EV01495715	EV01495736		A; F; H; R
PTX-813	EagleView Technologies GutterReport, November 4, 2015	EV026438	EV026441		A; F; H; R
PTX-814	EagleView Technologies Standard Report, September 11, 2012	EV380447	EV380451		A; F; H; R
PTX-815	EagleView Technologies Walls Only Report, July 23, 2013	EV497785	EV497797		A; F; H; R
PTX-816	EagleView Technologies Property Risk Management Report, October 8, 2013	EV498215	EV498219		A; F; H; R
PTX-817	EagleView Technologies QuickSquares, October 8, 2013	EV498473	EV498473		A; F; H; R
PTX-818	EagleView Technologies QuickSquares Extended Coverage, March 5, 2015	EV552130	EV552130		A; F; H; R
PTX-819	EagleView Technologies Property Brush Image Risk Report	EV561703	EV561708		A; F; H; R
PTX-820	Allstate Insurance ClaimsReady Report, June 10, 2013	EV562902	EV562910		A; F; H; R
PTX-821	EagleView Technologies Property Risk Management Brush Report, March 14, 2013	EV571427	EV571436		A; F; H; R
PTX-822	EagleView FAQ Most Popular, http://www.eagleview.com/SupportServices/EagleViewCustomerSupport/EagleViewFAQ.aspx#MostPopular	EV01555449	EV01555484		A; F; H; R
PTX-823	Email Chain from J. Taylor to P. Devdhar et. al re Roofing field test data request, June 11, 2008	XW00356621	XW00356623		H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-824	Email Chain from F. Coyne to J. Loveland re EagleView, April 6, 2012	XW00395033	XW00395035	Equitable Estoppel Motion	H; R
PTX-825	Email from J. Taylor to K. Beatty re Project Aerial Report-Property InSight v0.7, June 2, 2015	XW00055846	XW00055846		H; R; P
PTX-826	Email Chain from J. Taylor to Da. Luse re Chris Pershing at Eagle View, February 23, 2010	XW00285321	XW00285322		H; R; P
PTX-827	Presentation by Xactware re Xactimate Internal Pictometry Tool for Roofs	XW00285399	XW00285412		H; R
PTX-828	Email Chain from N. Sykes to D. Norton et. al re Xactimate v.25.5 Released - TBD??, May 28, 2009	XW00303058	XW00303061		H; R; P
PTX-829	Email from N. Sykes to J. Taylor re The Hartford RFP Meeting Notes, February 2, 2009	XW00303479	XW00303480		H; R; P
PTX-830	Xactware Revenue Statement -- "Xactware Revenue Statement, as of February and March 2015"	XW00512462	XW00512480		H; R; X
PTX-831	Fourth Amendment to Master Product License Agreement between Xactware Solutions, Inc and West Bend Mutual, November 1, 2011	XW00513004	XW00513005		H; R; I
PTX-832	Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2017, 13-1031 Claims Adjusters, Examiners, and Investigators, https://www.bls.gov/oes/2017/may/oes131031.htm	EV01555485	EV01555493	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R
PTX-833	WITHDRAWN				
PTX-834	FTC Complaint re Verisk and Eagle View Merger	XW00056883	XW00056895		H; R; P
PTX-835	The Stories Behind the EagleView Reports	EV033575	EV033578		H; A; F; R; P
PTX-836	Using 3D Aerial Measurement Reports to Increase Efficiency and ROI on Roofing Claims	EV390111	EV390111		H; A; F; R; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-837	Technology Provides A Precise Look at Roof Measuring	EV442413	EV442416		H; A; F; R; P
PTX-838	EagleView® Technologies Named by Inc. Magazine as one of America's Fastest Growing Private Companies	EV01548656	EV01548659	Stevenson Opening	H; A; F; R; P
PTX-839	Implementing Aerial Measurement Reports at FNOL	EV631484	EV631484		H; A; F; R; P
PTX-840	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13), February 29, 2016	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-841	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Responses to Pictometry International Corp.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-8), February 29, 2016	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-842	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-21), February 29, 2016	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-843	Xactware Solutions, Inc.'s Responses to Pictometry International Corp.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-9), February 29, 2016	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-844	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13), December 19, 2016	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-845	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13), May 9, 2017	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-846	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Third Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13), September 1, 2017	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-847	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 14-23), December 11, 2017	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-848	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Fourth Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13), December 18, 2017	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-849	Verisk Analytics, Inc.'s Fifth Supplemental Responses to Eagle View Technologies, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13), January 18, 2018	N/A	N/A		H; C; R
PTX-850	Farmers Insurance Company, Inc. Claims Report, May 10, 2012	EV013734	EV013735	Arnold Opening	A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-851	Presentation by Eagle View Technologies re Board Meeting, July 28, 2009	EV050921	EV050974	Arnold Opening	A; F; R; H
PTX-852	EagleView Technologies, Inc. v. RoofWalk, Inc. <i>et al.</i> , No. 2:12-cv-00544-RSL, Dkt. No. 12, 2nd Amended Complaint, (W.D. Wash. June 4, 2012)	EV034640	EV034648	Arnold Opening	R; H
PTX-853	EagleView Technologies Technical Study, What Low-cost Roof Reports Really Cost Carriers	EV01493779	EV01493780	EV's Supp Resp to Rog No. 13	A; F; R; P; H
PTX-854	The Impact of Technology on Claims ROI	EV551287	EV551297	EV's Supp Resp to Rog No. 13	A; F; R; P; H
PTX-855	Presentation by Verisk Analytics re Project Aerial IC Discussion Sale Process and Diligence Update, May 1, 2012	XW00214560	XW00214587	EV's Supp Resp to Rog No. 13	R; P; H
PTX-856	Presentation by EagleView re Corporate Presentation, January, 2015	EV777760	EV777804	EV's Supp Resp to Rog No. 13	A; F; R; P; C; H
PTX-857	Presentation by Eagle View Technologies re Corporate Presentation, March, 2015	VISTA-00000157	VISTA-00000200	EV's Supp Resp to Rog No. 13	A; F; R; P; C; H
PTX-858	Get an EagleView Report	EV01553387	EV01553391	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	A; F; R; H
PTX-859	EagleView Home Page, February 19, 2017	EV01553392	EV01553395	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-860	EagleView Home Page, January 13, 2012	EV01553396	EV01553397	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-861	EagleView Home Page, January 16, 2015	EV01553398	EV01553401	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-862	EagleView Home Page, June 25, 2014	EV01553402	EV01553403	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-863	EagleView Home Page, March 31, 2012	EV01553404	EV01553405	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-864	EagleView Home Page, March 7. 2015	EV01553406	EV01553410	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-865	EagleView Home Page, May 1, 2013	EV01553411	EV01553414	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-866	EagleView Home Page September 18. 2012	EV01553415	EV01553416	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 5	R; A; F; H
PTX-867	FY 2012 Summary Revenue Analysis	EV043436	EV043436	EV's Supp Resp to Rog No. 13	A; F; R; H
PTX-868	Presentation by EagleView re Commercial Business	EV757140	EV757150	EV's 2nd Supp Resp to Rog No. 15	A; F; R; P; H

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-869	2016 Quarter 1 Satisfaction Survey Comments	XW00067071	XW00067071	EV's 3rd Supp Resp to Rog No. 15	H; R; P
PTX-870	Competitive Advantages/Weaknesses Xactware	XW00070183	XW00070183	EV's 3rd Supp Resp to Rog No. 15	H; R; P
PTX-871	Second Corrected Petition (Paper 10), April 8, 2016, (IPR2016-00582)	EV01555494	EV01555553		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-872	Petitioner's Request for Rehearing (Paper 16), September 9, 2016, (IPR2016-00582)	EV01555554	EV01555565		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-873	Decision Denying Request for Rehearing (Paper 17), September 21, 2016 (IPR2016-00582)	EV01555566	EV01555569		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-874	Petitioner's Request for Rehearing (Paper 16), September 9, 2016, (IPR2016-00586)	EV01555570	EV01555588		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-875	Decision Denying Request for Rehearing (Paper 18), November 2, 2016, (IPR2016-00586)	EV01555589	EV01555598		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-876	Second Corrected Petition (Paper 9), April 8, 2016, (IPR2016-00587)	EV01555599	EV01555662		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-877	Petitioner's Request for Rehearing (Paper 15), September 9, 2016, (IPR2016-00587)	EV01555663	EV01555681		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-878	Decision Denying Request for Rehearing (Paper 16), September 30, 2016, (IPR2016-00587)	EV01555682	EV01555692		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-879	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 9), May 23, 2016, (IPR2016-00589)	EV01555693	EV01555696		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-880	Corrected Petition (Paper 7), April 8, 2016, (IPR-2016-00590)	EV01555697	EV01555758		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-881	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 8), May 23, 2016, (IPR-2016-00590)	EV01555759	EV01555834		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-882	Second Corrected Petition (Paper 9), April 8, 2016, (IPR2016-00592)	EV01555835	EV01555898		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-883	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 10), June 2, 2016, (IPR2016-00592)	EV01555899	EV01555972		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-884	Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner Response, January 27, 2017, (IPR2016-00592)	EV01555973	EV01556004		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-885	Petition (Paper 1), September 15, 2016, (IPR2016-01775)	EV01556005	EV01556071		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-886	Petition (Paper 1), October 5, 2016, (IPR2017-00021)	EV01556072	EV01556139		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-887	Petition (Paper 1), October 5, 2016, (IPR2017-00025)	EV01556140	EV01556207		R; P; C; D; MIL

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-888	Petition (Paper 1), October 5, 2016, (IPR2017-00027)	EV01556208	EV01556270		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-889	Petition (Paper 1), November 30, 2016, (IPR2017-00363)	EV01556271	EV01556340		R; P; C; D; MIL
PTX-890	ClaimsReady Report, October 23, 2013	EV000888	EV000897		A; F; H; R
PTX-891	Adjuster Assisted 3D Report, October 23, 2013	EV000898	EV000907		A; F; H; R
PTX-892	ClaimsReady Report, October 23, 2013	EV001218	EV001227		A; F; H; R
PTX-893	Premium Report, July 2, 2012	EV002052	EV002063		A; F; H; R
PTX-894	GutterReport, January 31, 2014	EV002066	EV002069		A; F; H; R
PTX-895	QuickSquares, January 30, 2014	EV002070	EV002071		A; F; H; R
PTX-896	Premium Report, July 2, 2012	EV002072	EV002081		A; F; H; R
PTX-897	Property Risk Management Brush Report, March 14, 2013	EV002140	EV002148		A; F; H; R
PTX-898	Property Risk Management Report , February 13, 2013	EV005953	EV005960		A; F; H; R
PTX-899	Pool Report, August 18, 2015	EV006488	EV006488		A; F; H; R
PTX-900	ClaimsReady Report, November 3, 2012	EV00852452	EV00852460		A; F; H; R
PTX-901	Premium Report, April 18, 2014	EV01440269	EV01440278		A; F; H; R
PTX-902	Premium Report, October 30, 2015	EV026408	EV026418		A; F; H; R
PTX-903	QuickSquares, May 29, 2015	EV026436	EV026437		A; F; H; R
PTX-904	ClaimsREady Roof & Walls Report, March 23, 2015	EV026452	EV026468		A; F; H; R
PTX-905	Property Risk Management Report, March 24, 2015	EV026469	EV026475		A; F; H; R
PTX-906	Eagle View Roof Reports	EV000888	EV002165		A; F; H; R
PTX-907	Eagle View Roof Reports	EV005666	EV006488		A; F; H; R
PTX-908	Eagle View Roof Reports	EV026408	EV026530		A; F; H; R
PTX-909	Eagle View Roof Reports	EV00852202	EV00852952		A; F; H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-910	Eagle View Roof Reports	EV01439277	EV01441260		A; F; H; R
PTX-911	Eagle View Roof Reports	EV01490670	EV01491126		A; F; H; R
PTX-912	Employment agreement between Eagle View Technologies and David P. Carlson, August 18, 2008	EV695965	EV695976		A; F; R; H
PTX-913	Separation agreement between Eagle View Technologies, Inc. and David P. Carlson, July 17, 2009	EV01553678	EV01553682		A; F; R; H
PTX-914	Consulting agreement between Eagle View Technologies, Inc. and David P. Carlson, dated January 17, 2012	EV449180	EV449182		A; F; R; H
PTX-915	Verisk Analytics, Inc., to Acquire EagleView Technology Corporation to Extend Its Analytic Capabilities in Aerial Imagery, https://www.verisk.com/archived/2014/january/verisk-analytics-inc-to-acquire-eagleview-technology-corporation-to-extend-its-analytic-capabilities-in-aerial-imagery/	EV01556341	EV01556342		
PTX-916	Email Chain from M. Nikolsky to L. Heeb et. al re New patent properties, September 5, 2014	XW00390259	XW00390261		P; R
PTX-917	AS, RI, PI Units, February 2012–March 13, 2019	XW00942367	XW00942367		
PTX-918	EagleView RFP Appendix	EV568923	EV569024		A; F; H; R
PTX-919	Email Chain from H. West to R. Daga re Eagle View Wall Report Case Study, March 17, 2015	EV552765	EV552766		A; F; H; R
PTX-920	Property InSight Report 444 S. 1660 E, Pleasant Grove, UT 84062	XW00017497	XW00017508		H; R
PTX-921	Property InSight Report 3 Main St., Anytown, MI 12345	XW00018699	XW00018709		H; R
PTX-922	Property InSight Report 123 Somewhere St., Anytown, MO 12345	XW00018715	XW00018715		H; R
PTX-923	Property InSight Report 7 Main Street, Anytown, MO 12345	XW00019727	XW00019738		H; R
PTX-924	Property InSight Report 1 Main St., Anytown, TX 12345	XW00019742	XW00019757		H; R
PTX-925	Roof InSight Report, 1514 SW 10th Avenue, Hartwell, KS 66621, July 31, 2013	XW00022892	XW00022896		H; R
PTX-926	Roof InSight Report, 1787 S Lafayette St. Denver, CO 80210, September 23, 2015	XW00023572	XW00023578		H; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)
Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-927	Roof InSight Report, 3341 North 100 West, Lehi, UT 84043, August 25, 2015	XW00025973	XW00025977		H; R
PTX-928	Roof InSight Report, 7261 Luz De Color Ct., El Paso, TX 79912, July 30, 2015	XW00026395	XW00026399		H; R
PTX-929	Email Chain from Lisa Heeb to Jim Baunach et. al re New patent properties, October 28, 2014	XW00308268	XW00308273		P; R
PTX-930	Attachment to Jim Baunach response to Lisa Heeb et. al re New patent properties, December 10, 2014	XW00308274	XW00308291		
PTX-931	Xactware Revenue Statement, as of February 28, 2019	XW00942368	XW00942368		
PTX-932	Eagle View Techs., Inc. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., Civ. Action No. 1:15-cv-07025-RBK-JS, Dkt. No. 406 (Mar. 13, 2018) (Stipulation With Respect To Geomni)	N/A	N/A		P
PTX-933	Eagle View Reference Guide for Measuring Technicians, 3-D Aerial Views of the Structure, November 13, 2008	EV01426960	EV01426994		A; F; H; R; C
PTX-934	Eagle View Reference Guide for Measuring Technicians, 3-D Aerial Views of the Structure, October 15, 2008	EV01427067	EV01427100		A; F; H; R; C
PTX-935	Eagle View Technologies Set Reference Plane Notes	EV01427118	EV01427136		A; F; H; R; C
PTX-936	EagleView Technologies Inc. Report Revenue P&L Analysis - Insurance (with 2009-2019 average selling price history)	EV01556343	EV01556343		A; F; H; S
PTX-937	Pictometry International Corp., Eagleview Technologies Inc. Income Statement Nov. 2017 - Feb. 2019	EV01556344	EV01556344		A; F; H; S
PTX-938	Eagle View Sales Data 2016-2019	EV01556345	EV01556345		A; F; H; S
PTX-939	AS, RI, PI Units (Jan. 2012 - Mar. 2019)	XW00942515	XW00942515		
PTX-940	Xactware Revenue Statement, as of March 31, 2019	XW00942516	XW00942516		
PTX-941	Email Chain from C. Barrow to D. Schultz re Bloomberg Article, December 9, 2011	EV469560	EV469562		A; F; H; R; P
PTX-942	EagleView Technology Corporation BOD Presentation, October 27, 2015	EV538890	EV539051		A; F; H; R; C; LA
PTX-943	EagleView Article re "Proven Accuracy"	EV563522	EV563523		A; F; H; LA
PTX-944	EagleView Technologies, Inc. Management Presentation	EV634009	EV634056		A; F; H; LA
PTX-945	EagleView Executive Summary Presentation, May 2015	EV781030	EV781054		A; F; H; LA
PTX-946	Email Chain from H. West to R. Daga re Eagleview list, March 13, 2015	EV552466	EV552472		A; F; H; R; P; C
PTX-947	Email chain from C. Barrow to R. Daga re Peril Based Ordering Issue, April 22, 2016	EV744395	EV744395		A; F; H; R; P; C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description	Beg Bates	End Bates	Source	Objections
PTX-948	Email chain from R. Daga to C. Barrow re Need Help- Rishi Follow Up, August 4, 2015	EV755929	EV755930		A; F; H; R; P
PTX-949	Email chain from R. Daga to D. Schultz re Automated Roof Reports, March 13, 2015	EV764959	EV764960		A; F; H; R; P; C
PTX-950	Email chain from R. Daga to H. West re XA Integration Issues, March 16, 2015	EV765061	EV765061		A; F; H; R; P; I; C
PTX-951	Email chain from R. Daga to C. Barrow re Eagleview Extension with USAA March 23, 2015	EV765164	EV765165		A; F; H; LA
PTX-952	Email chain from R. Daga to D. Schultz and F. Giuffrida re EagleView Introduction, October 27, 2015	EV01425101	EV01425104		A; F; H; I; LA
PTX-953	Roof InSight Internal Tech Support FAQ	XW00015666	XW00015669		H; R; P; LA
PTX-954	Roof InSight – Property InSight Customer Analysis	XW00023040	XW00023042		H; S; LA; 1002
PTX-955	Email Chain from J. Lewis to B. Goodrich et. al re how to access a Roof InSight report, June 10, 2015	XW00027438	XW00027440		R; P; C
PTX-956	Xactware Press Release Draft entitled “Xactware’s Property InSight is Now Available”	XW00075039	XW00075040		R; LA; 1002
PTX-957	Email Chain from M. Allen to J. Lewis and J. Taylor re discrepancies between Roof InSight diagram and report, November 15, 2013	XW00047235	XW00047237		R; P; C; H
PTX-958	Email Chain from W. Loveland to K. Reid and K. Loveland re Roof InSight samples for roofing show, February 20, 2015	XW00072115	XW00072116		R
PTX-959	Xactware Roof InSight FAQs, January 26, 2015	XW00041418	XW00041419		

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

ABBREV.	OBJECTION	RULE / EXPLANATION
A	Authentication or Identification (FRE 901)	The requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.
Arg	Argumentative	
AT	Attorney Objections Not Removed	
BSE	Beyond Scope of Direct / Cross / Or Redirect Examination	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope of the direct, cross, or redirect examination.
BSS	Beyond Scope of Subpoena	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope of the subpoena
BST	Beyond Scope of Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Topic	Objectionable because the testimony exceeds the scope for which the witness was designated to testify pursuant Rule 30(b)(6).
C	Cumulative, Duplicative, Wasteful or Undue Delay (FRE 403)	Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of duplicative and/or cumulative evidence.
Char	Improper Character Evidence (FRE 404)	
Cmpd	Compound	
D	Not Produced During Discovery	
F	Lack of Foundation (FRE 602)	Objectionable because a witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter.
H	Hearsay Rule (FRE 802)	Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority or by Act of Congress.
I	Incomplete Document (FRE 106)	Objectionable because document is incomplete and the introduction of the remaining portions or related documents ought, in fairness, to be considered contemporaneously with it.
ID	Improper/Incomplete Designation (FRCP 32(a)(6))	Objectionable because additional parts of the testimony in fairness should be considered with the part of the testimony designated.
IC	Improper/Incomplete Counter Designation (FRCP 32(a)(6))	Objectionable because additional parts of the testimony in fairness should be considered with the part of the testimony designated.
IO	Improper Lay or Expert Opinion (FRE 701-703)	Objectionable because the testimony is outside the scope of proper lay or expert testimony.
IP	Improper Use of Deposition Testimony (FRCP 32)	Objectionable because the designation is inconsistent with the proper use of deposition testimony pursuant to FRCP 32.
IDe	Improper Designation of Witness who will be Called Live	Objectionable because the witness who gave the designated testimony will be called to testify at trial.
LC	Legal Conclusion (FRE 403)	Objectionable because witness testimony constituting a legal conclusion creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

		the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
LD	Leading (FRE 611)	Objectionable because leading questions should not be used on direct examination except as necessary to develop the witness's testimony.
M	Mischaracterizes Prior Testimony (FRE 401-403, 611)	Objectionable because the designation includes mischaracterization of prior testimony, as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
MD	Mischaracterizes Underlying Document	Objectionable because the designation includes mischaracterization of an underlying document, as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
NE	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence	Objectionable because the question assumes facts not in evidence.
NR	Nonresponsive	Objectionable because the designated testimony is not responsive to the question.
NT	Not Testimony	Objectionable because the designated material is not testimonial.
OS	Offer of Settlement (FRE 408)	Evidence of an offer of consideration to compromise or attempt to compromise a claim, or conduct or a statement made during compromise negotiations about the claim, is not admissible.
P	Prejudicial, Confusing, Vague and/or Misleading (FRE 403)	Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.
PK	Lack of Personal Knowledge (FRE 602)	Objectionable because lack of personal knowledge makes the witness incompetent to testify about particular facts.
PR	Privilege (FRE 501-502)	The evidence is subject to a claim of attorney-client privilege or other privilege.
R	Relevance (FRE 401, 402)	All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence that is not relevant is not admissible.
SP	Calls for Speculation	Objectionable because the designation includes a question calling for speculation and/or speculation as a result the testimony lacks relevance and creates a danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, or wasting time.
S	Summaries (FRE 1006)	The party relying on the summary must establish its accuracy to the court's satisfaction. <i>See</i> Graham, Handbook of Federal Evidence § 1006.1 (5th ed. 2001). <i>United States v. Pelullo</i> , 964 F.2d 193, 204 (3d Cir. 1992) ("It is well established that summary evidence is admissible under Rule 1006 only if the underlying materials upon which the summary is based are admissible.").
V	Vague, Ambiguous or Overbroad (FRE 611)	
105	Limited Admissibility (FRE 105)	When evidence that is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.
701	Improper Lay Opinion	If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et al.
Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (D.N.J.)

Defendants' Objection Key

	Testimony (FRE 701)	opinion is limited as provided by this rule.
1002	Best Evidence (FRE 1002)	An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless the rules or a federal statute provide otherwise.
PD	Post Dated Filing Date (FRE 105)	If post-dated evidence is admitted as to one purpose but not admissible as for another purpose (e.g., for obviousness analysis), the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.
Badgering	Badgering the Witness	Inappropriate badgering of the witness.
X		Exhibit has not been provided, the copy provided is illegible, and/or the entry includes multiple documents.
Y	Wrong Document Identified or Incorrect Description of Document	
MIL	Motion in Limine	Subject to motion in limine.

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

Exhibit	Bates Begin	Bates End	Description	Objections
DTX-1	EV056224	EV057433	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436 (12/253,092)	
DTX-2	EV057435	EV058412	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,170,840 (12/467,244)	
DTX-3	EV058414	EV059396	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,209,152 (12/467,250)	
DTX-4	EV061359	EV066409	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,818,770 (13/438,288)	
DTX-5	EV066411	EV071523	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,825,454 (13/474,504)	
DTX-6	EV071693	EV072210	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,129,376 (14/449,045)	
DTX-7	EV072212	EV072667	Certified Copy of File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,135,737 (14/450,108)	
DTX-8	EV01552484	EV01552512	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436	
DTX-9	EV01552513	EV01552558	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,170,840	
DTX-10	EV01552559	EV01552605	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,209,152	
DTX-11	EV01552606	EV01552655	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,818,770	
DTX-12	EV01552656	EV01552705	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,825,454	
DTX-13	EV01552706	EV01552756	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 9,129,376	
DTX-14	EV01552757	EV01552807	Certified Copy of U.S. Patent No. 9,135,737	
DTX-15	EV00032127	EV00033457	Ex Parte Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436 (12/253,092)	
DTX-16	EV00000015	EV00000048	Document entitled "EagleView Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	A; C
DTX-17	EV00000190	EV00000235	Document entitled "EagleView Reference Guide: Twister"	A; C
DTX-18	EV00000190	EV00000235	Powerpoint entitled "Reference Guide: Twister"	A; C
DTX-19	EV00000236	EV00000269	October 15, 2008 document entitled "EagleView Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	A; C
DTX-20	EV00024096	EV00024130	June 12, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	A; C
DTX-21	EV00024131	EV00024176	October, 15, 2008 document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: Twister"	A; C
DTX-22	EV00024181	EV00024215	June 12, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	A; C
DTX-23	EV00024225	EV00024270	October 15, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: Twister"	A; C
DTX-24	EV00025565	EV00025568	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies Brand Standards and Guidelines"	A; R; P
DTX-25	EV00027139	EV00027997	Document entitled "Aerial Roof Estimation Systems and Methods Cross Reference to Related Applications"	A; C, I
DTX-26	EV00028607	EV028617	Applicant's Reply to Office Action for Application NO. 12/467,250	A; C, I
DTX-27	EV00031541	EV031558	Applicant's Reply to Office Action for Application NO. 14, 450, 108	A; C, I
DTX-28	EV00031622	EV00031649	US Patent No. 8,078,436	A; C
DTX-29	EV00032008	EV00032020	December 16, 2014 Complaint, "In the Matter of Verisk Analytics, Inc., Insurance Services Office, Inc. and EagleView Technology Corp.", Provisionally Redacted for Public Version	A, P
DTX-30	EV00032372	EV00032398	October 24, 2013 Declaration of Chris Pershing and exhibits A-C thereto filed in support of 8,078,436 patent prosecution.	A; Y; I
DTX-31	EV00033470	EV00033470	January 11, 2012 email from J. Cattle to C. Pershing, et al. re: "2012 Product/Engineering Planning Meeting"	A; F; R; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
 Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
 Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-32	EV00033471	EV00033497	January 11, 2012 entitled "2012 Product/Engineering Planning Meeting - Developing the 2012 Product Roadmap"	A; F; R
DTX-33	EV00033506	EV00033511	March 12, 2012 memorandum from D. Ekman, re: "Estimating Update"	A; F; R; P
DTX-34	EV00033512	EV00033528	PowerPoint entitled "EagleView Estimating Technology Overview Kumaran Sundar March 2012"	A; F; R; P
DTX-35	EV00033530	EV00033535	March 16, 2012 memorandum from R. Daga to A. Burch re: "Burch Territory Plan"	A; F; R
DTX-36	EV00033539	EV00033541	May 8, 2012 email chain between H. Ellsworth and C. Barrow, et al. re: "Good Morning"	A; F; R; P
DTX-37	EV00033545	EV00033545	May 5, 2012 email from D. Elkman to C. Barrow, cc: K. DeBoer re: "Estimating BOD slides"	A; F; R
DTX-38	EV00033546	EV00033552	PowerPoint entitled "2012 Estimating Update Dean Ekman May Board of Directors February 14, 2013"	A; F; R
DTX-39	EV00033553	EV00033553	May 16, 2012 email from R. Daga to C. Barrow re: "Travelers adjusted feedback from Smile and Dial 5.16.12"	A; F; H
DTX-40	EV00033555	EV00033573	PowerPoint entitled "EagleView Technologies subtitle February 14, 2013"	A; F; R; P
DTX-41	EV00033580	EV00033583	November 19, 2012 memorandum from D. Elkman re: "Estimating Update "	A; F; R; P; H
DTX-42	EV00033595	EV00033697	April 11, 2012 Complaint, and exhibits thereto, filed in <i>Eagle View Technologies, Inc. v. Aerialogics, LLC</i> (W.D.Wa 12-cv-00618-RAJ)	R; P; 105; ML
DTX-43	EV00034406	EV00034413	April 2, 2012 Complaint, and exhibits thereto, filed in <i>EagleView v. RoofWalk (W.D.Wa 12-cv-00544)</i>	R; P; C; ML
DTX-44	EV00034499	EV00034498	April 5, 2012 Amended Complaint in <i>EagleView v. Roofwalk (W.D.Wa 12-cv-00544)</i>	R; P; C; ML
DTX-45	EV00037212	EV00037246	U.S. Patent Pub. 2009/0304227 by Kennedy, et al.	R; P; C; P; ML
DTX-46	EV00037525	EV00037551	U.S. Patent Pub. 2011/0205245 to Kennedy, et al.	R; P; C; P; ML
DTX-47	EV00042355	EV00042389	US Patent No. 8,417,061 to Kennedy, et al.	A; P; ML
DTX-48	EV00043415	EV00043415	Spreadsheet entitled "EagleView Technologies Sales Forecast FY2013 Forecast"	A; F
DTX-49	EV00043416	EV00043416	Spreadsheet entitled "Xactware Analysis 05-31-15"	A; F
DTX-50	EV00043417	EV00043417	Spreadsheet entitled "Xactware Analysis 04-30-15"	A; F
DTX-51	EV00043428	EV00043428	Spreadsheet entitled "Revised - FY2013 YTD Summary Revenue Analysis (monthly details) - ADJ Industry Mix"	A; F
DTX-52	EV00043448	EV00043448	Spreadsheet entitled "Xactware Report 04-30-15"	A; F
DTX-53	EV00043449	EV00043453	September 27, 2013 Email chain to F. Giuffrida, R. Daga et al., from C. Barrows re: "Re: 3603 Capitol Drive"	R; P; ML
DTX-54	EV00043812	EV00043822	Unexecuted "Agreement" between Xactware Solutions, Inc. and Eagle View Technologies, Inc.	ML

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-55	EV00043829	EV00043834	November 6, 2008 email chain between C. Dieveney and C. Barrow re: "EagleView Next Steps: Xactware Agreement!"	A; F; H
DTX-56	EV00043861	EV00043862	November 7-10, 2008 email chain between B. Hawk and C. Barrow re: "EagleView"	A; F; H
DTX-57	EV00043897	EV00043898	November 17, 2008 email chain between B. Hawk, C. Barrow, et al. re: "EagleView"	A; F; H
DTX-58	EV00044538	EV00044543	Document entitled "Technology Provides a Precise Look at Roof Measuring"	A
DTX-59	EV00044614	EV00044614	Document entitled "Eagleview vs. Geoestimator"	A; F; H; P; ML
DTX-60	EV00045623	EV00045623	October 30, 2009 email from R. Bateman to Eagleview Shareholders, cc'ing C. Barrow re: "Eagle View Q3 2009 Update"	A; F; R
DTX-61	EV00045624	EV00045626	Document entitled "Shareholder Update 10/30/09 Eagle View Shareholders"	A; F; R
DTX-62	EV00046109	EV00046111	December 10, 2009 email chain between D. Foster, D. Shultz, C. Barrow, et al. re: "Dwight Foster, EagleView: Sample Reports"	A; F; H
DTX-63	EV00046647	EV00046652	Document entitled "Technology Provides A Precise Look At Roof Measuring"	A; F; C
DTX-64	EV00047113	EV00047114	September 30, 2010, email chain between D. Schultz and H. Ellsworth, et al. re: "RE: Remote Roof Reports with Complete Material List"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-65	EV00047383	EV00047385	November 8, 2010 email chain between B. Grant, C. Barrows, et al. re: "Roofing estimation using pictometry"	A; F; H; PK
DTX-66	EV00047551	EV00047552	January 7, 2011 email chain between W. Barnes, B. Grant, P. Gamido, et al. re: "Xactware - EV price for SF"	A; F; R; P
DTX-67	EV00047623	EV00047629	January 15, 2011 email from B. Grant to C. Barrow, cc: J. Polchin and attached PowerPoint entitled "Business Development"	A; F
DTX-68	EV00048297	EV00048297	Spreadsheet entitled "Automation Plan v4"	A; F; H; R
DTX-69	EV00049094	EV00049103	June 12, 2012 Correspondence from Deloitte & Touche LLP to Yuri Pikover, Chairman of the Audit Committee, Eagle View Technologies, Inc.	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-70	EV00049104	EV00049122	Document entitled "Eagle View Technologies, Inc. Consolidated Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, and Independent Auditors' Report"	A; F; H; R
DTX-71	EV00049142	EV00049142	Spreadsheet entitled "Eagle View Financials - GAAP (Final) (4.1)"	A; F; H; R
DTX-72	EV00050122	EV00050122	February 13, 2009, Email chain from C. Barrow to M. Smith et al, re: "RE: New home page text"	R; P; C
DTX-73	EV00050189	EV00050189	Document entitled "take the GUESStimating our of ESTIMATING"	A; F
DTX-74	EV00050921	EV00050974	Document entitled "Board Meeting July 28, 2009 Bothwell, WA"	A; F
DTX-75	EV00051118	EV00051120	October 9, 2009 email chain between C. Barrow and S. Clair, et al. re: "RE: Prototype & User Flow Updates"	A; F; R; P
DTX-76	EV00052136	EV00052171	Document entitled "Bob Grant EVP Sales & Marketing February 11, 2010"	A; F
DTX-77	EV00052619	EV00052642	Document entitled "Board Meeting April 20, 2010 Dial-in Board Call"	A; F; R
DTX-78	EV0052844	EV0052865	May 28, 2010 email from C. Barrow to R. Daga, re: "lean slides" and attaching "Accuracy and Precision (2).pptx"	A; F
DTX-79	EV00053502	EV00053502	Spreadsheet entitled "EagleView vs. GeoEstimator"	A; F; H; ML
DTX-80	EV00053567	EV00053610	Document entitled "Board Meeting September 7, 2010 In Person / Teleconference Board Meeting Bothwell, WA"	A; F

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-81	EV00053857	EV00053857	Spreadsheet entitled "Competitor Spreadsheet"	A; F; P; ML
DTX-82	EV00053905	EV00053910	Document entitled "EagleView Pricing 2011"	A; F
DTX-83	EV00054121	EV00054160	Document entitled "EagleView Integration: Decrease Processing Time and Increase Completed Daily Estimates Chris Barrow, President & CEO February 13, 2013"	A; F
DTX-84	EV00072212	EV00072667	Certified Copy of U.S. Application 14/450,108 Patent	
DTX-85	EV00072669	EV00072688	Certified Copy of U.S. Application 60/925,072 Patent	
DTX-86	EV00072690	EV00072758	Certified Copy of U.S. Application 61/197,904 Patent	
DTX-87	EV00073227	EV00073273	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies Competitive Analysis"	A; F; ML
DTX-88	EV00073732	EV00073732	Spreadsheet entitled "Trial Balance and Account Rollups"	A; F
DTX-89	EV00074545	EV00074547	Document entitled "Services Agreement, 3C Network and Eagle View Technologies, Inc."	A; F; H
DTX-90	EV00074671	EV00074671	Spreadsheet containing 2010-2011 operational wages and fees	A; F
DTX-91	EV00076075	EV00076103	PowerPoint entitled "Board Meeting April 20, 2010 Dial-in Board Call"	A; F
DTX-92	EV00076217	EV00076231	PowerPoint entitled "Bob Grant, EVP 7/10/2010"	A; F
DTX-93	EV00077885	EV00077914	PowerPoint entitled "Board Meeting June 22, 2010 In Person Board Meeting & Strategy Session Las Vegas"	A; F; H
DTX-94	EV00078428	EV00078436	Document entitled "Order Master Service Agreement No. 523150 Order No. 2"	A; F
DTX-95	EV00078951	EV00078955	PowerPoint entitled "Construction Sales March 20, 2012"	A; F
DTX-96	EV00080127	EV00080129	Document entitled "FY2013 Board Operating Plan - Revenue Executive Summary"	A; F
DTX-97	EV00080186	EV00080186	Spreadsheet entitled "Pictometry International PBS Signed Contrast Forecast"	A; F; H; R
DTX-98	EV00137341	EV00137341	May 23, 2011 email from T. Bacon to All Offices re: "Pictometry Press Release"	A; F; H; R
DTX-99	EV00137343	EV00137343	May 23, 2011 document entitled "Pictometry Acquires GeoEstimator"	A; F; H; R; ML
DTX-100	EV00141063	EV00141063	June 3, 2014 email from K. Edwards to EagleView (All Offices) re: "QuickSquares Mobile App launching Monday 6/9"	A; F; R
DTX-101	EV00144770	EV00144770	February 16, 2015 email from K. Edwards to EagleView (All Offices) re: "WallsLite Launch"	A; F; R
DTX-102	EV00158008	EV00158008	August 27, 2008 email chain between Y. Wang, F. Giuffrida, et al., re: "RE: Creation of 3-d wireframes"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-103	EV00172406	EV00172406	October 7, 2014 email from K. Edwards to EagleView (All Offices) re: "QuickSquares Android App Launch tomorrow"	A; F; R
DTX-104	EV00175445	EV00175446	April 16, 2015 email chain between M. Simburger and F. Giuffrida, et al., re: "Test Areas"	A; F; R; P
DTX-105	EV00231614	EV00231616	July 18, 2014 email chain between C. Schnauffer, F. Giuffrida, et al., re: "Recent competitor shopping"	A; F; R; P; ML
DTX-106	EV00239961	EV00239970	Document entitled: "Pictometry Memo"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-107	EV00285948	EV00285957	Document entitled "Roof Report Update, Pictometry"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-108	EV00286228	EV00286234	October 1, 2012, Email chain between D. Thornberry and C. Thornberry, et al., re: "FW: AppliCad eNews #134 - Hip-end Pitch Measure Tools at Metalcon 2012"	A; F; H
DTX-109	EV00333227	EV00333227	Spreadsheet entitled "Roof Measurement Volume and Production Tracking Worksheet 08-29-12"	A; F; H
DTX-110	EV00333455	EV00333467	Document entitled "2012 Pictometry Business Solutions - FY12 Highlights"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-111	EV00333831	EV00333833	August 9, 2011 email chain between C. Baughman, C. Hunt; D. Thornberry, et al., re: "Ohio Mutual Insurance Group"	A; F; H; R; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-112	EV00335274	EV00335275	June 30, 2011 email chain between J. Marcus, T. Scarpulla, D. Thornberry, et al., re: "Pictometry offer to PIPSO Members"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-113	EV00335628	EV00335643	Unexecuted, draft "Services Agreement" between Assurant Specialty Insurance and Pictometry	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-114	EV00335648	EV00335649	Document entitled "GeoEstimator Exceeds Customer Expectations"	A; F; H; ML; P
DTX-115	EV00335800	EV00335803	Document entitled "Pictometry, Prepared for: Allstate Insurance Date 8/25/2011, Prepared by: Chad Hunt"	A; F; H
DTX-116	EV00336111	EV00336112	Document entitled "GeoEstimator: Preferred Contractors Exclusive Owens Corning Discounts"	A; F; H; ML; P
DTX-117	EV00336115	EV00336152	PowerPoint entitled "GeoEstimator"	A; F; H; ML; P
DTX-118	EV00337687	EV00337691	Document entitled "Program Management Review - December 1st Highlights"	A; F; H
DTX-119	EV00337753	EV00337753	Spreadsheet entitled "Roof Measurement Volume and Production Tracking Worksheet 04-04-12"	A; F; H;
DTX-120	EV00337835	EV00337842	Document entitled "2012 PLRB Program Management Meeting Schedule / Debriefing"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-121	EV00337912	EV00337913	April 18, 2012 email from T. Guhl to J. Reich; D. Gallaher; D. Thornberry, et al. "Pictometry Update"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-122	EV00338070	EV00338087	Document entitled "Eagle View technologies April 22, 2012 Spectrum Equity"	A; F; H
DTX-123	EV00341037	EV00341038	Document entitled "Professional Roofer Magazine: What's Imagery Got to Do With It? Accuracy in Remote Roof Measurement Services"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-124	EV00341077	EV00341078	Document entitled "Xactware User Conference 2012, Aerial Sketch - Version 2"	A; F; H;
DTX-125	EV00342237	EV00342237	Spreadsheet entitled "Roof Measurement Volume and Production Tracking Worksheet 03-21-12"	A; F; H
DTX-126	EV00344928	EV00344939	Document entitled "April YTD Performance vs Prior Year" by Spectrum Equity	A; C; F; H; L; LF; R; S; PK
DTX-127	EV00345169	EV00345182	September 18, 2012 email from D. Thornberry to K. Relley re: "Dale T evaluation" and attaching "2012 performance DRT9-18-2012" Performance Review	A; C; H; F; L; PK; R; P
DTX-128	EV00350836	EV00350837	November 30, 2012 email from J. Pistritto to C. Hunt, et al. re: "Insurance_Target Strategies_11.30.2012.xlsx" and attaching document entitled "Insurance_Target Account Strategies_11.30.2012"	A; C; F; L; R
DTX-129	EV00350995	EV00351022	December 19, 2012 email from J. Marcus to D. Thornberry; cc: J. Pistritto, re: "Lynx" and attaching documents entitled "MSA Pictometry 538230.docx; Nationwide Exhibit 1 to Order.docx; Pictometry Order No. 1.docx"	A; C; F; L; R; H
DTX-130	EV00355056	EV00355138	Presentation entitled "PICTOMETRY INTERNATIONAL CORP Roof Measurement Reports"	A; C; F; L; R; H
DTX-131	EV00357944	EV00357951	Document entitled "Quick Reference Production Procedures, Pictometry"	A; C; F; L; R
DTX-132	EV00361629	EV00361631	June 23, 2011 email from D. Kinsman to R. Daga et al, re: "Allstate Call Followup / Portal Roadmap"	A; F; H; L; PK; R; P
DTX-133	EV00361754	EV00361755	October 18, 2008 email chain between R. Johnson to C. Barrow; B. Jackman re: "Eagle View Xactware Agreement 101608 Delivered"	A; F; L; R; P; ML
DTX-134	EV00362717	EV00362727	May 15, 2009 email chain between C. Johnson and R. Daga, et al., re: "Need to use EagleView" and attaching document entitled "Nationwide - Order No 1 to MSA 523150 02-01-09 .pdf"	A; F; H; L; PK; R; P
DTX-135	EV00363187	EV00363198	Presentation entitled "Xactware, June 9, 2016, EagleView - Xactware Integration Recap"	PD; A; F; L; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-136	EV00365237	EV00365245	July 1, 2010 email from P. Gamido to C. Barrow re: "FWD: State Farm Pricing" and attaching document entitled "EagleView - State Farm Pricing Confidential-rev.pptx"	A; C; F; H; L; LF; PD; R; P
DTX-137	EV00368612	EV00368620	June 6, 2011 email chain between P. Gamido and C. Barrow, et al. re: "Travelers meeting" and attaching document entitled "EagleView Technologies Master and Travelers VPG 1.1 - Review.docx"	A; F; H; L; R
DTX-138	EV00368795	EV00368795	July 8, 2011 email from P. Gamido to C. Barrow; R. Daga, D. Shultz; A. Bowman re: "Travelers notes meeting fyi...confidential"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-139	EV00370214	EV00370237	Presentation entitled "EagleView Technologies creating virtual 3-D models using Aerial Photography" by C. Barrow, CEO and J. Polchin, CFO	A; C; F; L; PK; R
DTX-140	EV00370401	EV00370402	November 8, 2011 email chain between R. Daga, C. Barrow, et al., re: "Competitors"	A; F; H; L; LF; ML; P; PK; R
DTX-141	EV00370403	EV00370405	November 8, 2011 email chain between R. Daga; C. Barrow; P. Gamido, et al., re: "contract discussion"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-142	EV00371125	EV00371149	Presentation entitled "EagleView: 2012 Product/ Engineering Planning Meeting, Developing the 2012 Product Roadmap, January 11, 2012"	A; F; L; ML; P; PK; R
DTX-143	EV00373110	EV00373111	February 16, 2012 Document entitled "Competitive Analysis Aerial Sketch V2"	A; F; L; P; PK; R
DTX-144	EV00373121	EV00373123	Document entitled "FAQ EagleView Extended Coverage"	A; F; C; L; PK; R
DTX-145	EV00375569	EV00375572	June 6, 2012 email chain between R. Daga, D. Schultz, C. Barrow, J. Polchin, et al., re: "Big3 Incoming Volumes - June 1-4"	A; F; H; L; PK; P; R; LF
DTX-146	EV00375573	EV00375577	June 6, 2012 email chain between R. Daga, D. Schultz, C. Barrow, J. Polchin, et al., re: "Big3 Incoming Volumes - June 1-4"	A; F; H; L; PK; P; R; LF
DTX-147	EV00375627	EV00375634	June 11, 2012 email from J. Polchin to C. Barrow and C. Pershing, re: "Term Sheet" and attaching document entitled "Term Sheet 6.11.12.pdf"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-148	EV00375843	EV00375856	June 15, 2012 email from Z. Long to Contractor Support, C. Barrow, et al. re: "Comparison Reports" and attachment thereto	A; F; H; L; LF; ML; P; PK; R
DTX-149	EV00375843	EV00375856	June 15, 2012 email from Z. Long to Contractor Support, C. Barrow, et al. re: "Comparison Reports" and attachment thereto	A; F; H; L; ML; R; C
DTX-150	EV00376408	EV00376410	July 13, 2012 email chain between J. Polchin to C. Barrow re: "Plan"	A; F; H; L; LF; P; PK; R
DTX-151	EV00380321	EV00380361	Presentation entitled "EagleView Technologies: Management Presentation"	A; C; F; L; PK; R
DTX-152	EV00380885	EV00380885	Spreadsheet entitled "Xactware - Historical Royalty Payments & Warrants Earned"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-153	EV00381956	EV00381961	Document entitled "Technology - The Future is Now Your Business"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-154	EV00384887	EV00384966	February 22, 2008 "Intellectual Property Valuation for Geospan Corporation" by Ocean Tomo	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-155	EV00386063	EV00386109	Document entitled "Eagle View Technologies Competitive Analysis"	A; F; L; ML; PK; R
DTX-156	EV00386175	EV00386189	Presentation entitled "EagleView Technologies: Company Overview October 2009"	A; C; F; L; PK; R
DTX-157	EV00386404	EV00386497	November 5, 2009, email chain between C. Barrow and D. Foster, et al. re: "Contractor Connection update"	A; F; H; L; F; PK; R; I; P
DTX-158	EV00388232	EV00388233	April 15, 2010 email chain between C. Barrow and E. Webecke, et al. re: "Fw: Realworld vs EV facet counts"	A; F; H; L; F; R; P
DTX-159	EV00397879	EV00397918	Presentation entitled "Board of Director's Meeting Presentation March 6, 2013 In-Person, Pictometry Corporate Offices"	A; F; L; C; R; PK
DTX-160	EV00398400	EV00398401	January 5, 2013 email chain between C. Pershing and R. Daga, et al., re: "Google Alert - xactware"	A; F; H; I; L; LF; ML; P; PK; R
DTX-161	EV00400841	EV00400841	Spreadsheet entitled "PartnerMatrix 031413"	A; F; I; L; P; PK; R; S
DTX-162	EV00403888	EV00403894	June 5, 2012 email chain between S. Bird and C. Johnson, et al., re: "Allstate Volume Discount Agreement" and attaching document entitled "PF-508 Allstate Volume Discount Agreement 2011 Amendment"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-163	EV00420577	EV00420579	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies, Inc. Memo to file Xactware Agreement and Classification of Warrant Expense"	A; F; L; PK; R; P
DTX-164	EV00429816	EV00429817	May 27, 2011 email chain between D. Schultz; H. Ellsworth; J. Polchin re: "Standard Report Opportunity"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-165	EV00433422	EV00433423	Document entitled "Aerial Measurement Reports: Uncovering the Hidden Costs of DIY Tools"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-166	EV00434086	EV00434149	Document entitled "Eagle View Technologies, Inc. Fair Value of Certain Identifiable Intangible Assets of SuperBuild, LLC As of October 27, 2011 Report Issues: June 12, 2012"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-167	EV00448666	EV00448666	Spreadsheet entitled "Eagleview Technologies 3YR FINANCIAL MODEL 12.2011"	A; F; L; PK; R; S
DTX-168	EV00449044	EV00449127	Presentation entitled "EagleView Board of Director's Meeting January 17, 2012"	A; C; L; PK; R
DTX-169	EV00449496	EV00449503	Document entitled "Residential Report, Aerialogics, Order No: 17960, January 30, 2012"	A; L; LF; PK
DTX-170	EV00452258	EV00452258	June 15, 2012 email chain between R. Daga, C. Barrow, D. Schultz, and A. Bowman, re: "Grange Ride Along Presentation"	A; L; H; LF; PK; R; I; P
DTX-171	EV00460920	EV00460931	May 6, 2008 Letters to D. Carlson from K. Cybul, enclosing "Pictometry, Mutual Non-Disclosure Agreement"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-172	EV00467626	EV00467627	October 19, 2010 email chain between C. Barrows, B. Combes, et al., re: "Remote Roof Measurements"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-173	EV00469398	EV00469399	December 2, 2011 email chain between C. Barrow, H. Ellsworth, et al. re: "Most Recent secret shopper"	A; F; H; L; LF; ML; PK; R; I
DTX-174	EV00469398	EV00469399	December 2, 2011 email chain between C. Barrow, H. Ellsworth, et al. re: "Most Recent secret shopper"	A; F; H; L; LF; ML; PK; R; I
DTX-175	EV00502219	EV00502302	Document entitled "Asset Purchase Agreement by and among Eagle View Technologies, Inc. and Superbuild, LLC"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-176	EV00534540	EV00534610	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies, Inc. Fair Value of Certain Assets and Liabilities Related to the Acquisition of EagleView Technologies, Inc. As of January 7, 2013, April 27, 2015"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-177	EV00534823	EV00534852	Document entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation and Subsidiaries Consolidated Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 and Independent Auditors' Report"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-178	EV00536576	EV00536640	Document entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation, VRC, Valuation of Intangible Assets Of EagleView Technology as of July 15, 2015, Report Date: February 8, 2016"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-179	EV00536800	EV00536800	Spreadsheet entitled "Xactware Analysis 2010 to 2016"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-180	EV00536802	EV00536906	Document entitled "Eagle View Technology Corporation BOD Presentation, Austin, TX, 03 March, 2016"	PD; F; L; PK
DTX-181	EV00536927	EV00536927	Spreadsheet entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation - GAAP (Final) 12-31-2015"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-182	EV00538060	EV00538075	Presentation entitled "Rishi Daga - CEO 90 Day Plan"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-183	EV00539588	EV00539593	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies, Inc., Investment Summary"	A; F; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-184	EV00541704	EV00541705	April 16, 2015 email chain between. C. Barrow and R. Daga re: "Q1 Volumes - Insurance, YOY"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; P; R; I
DTX-185	EV00543459	EV00543481	Document entitled "Construct June 22, 2015 Launch"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-186	EV00546163	EV00546166	Document entitled "EagleView and GAF Materials Corporation Strategic Alliance Term Sheet"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-187	EV00549556	EV00549557	December 2, 2014 email chain between J. Pistrutto; D. Schultz; R. Daga; and A. Bowman re: "Product Strategy_Solar_11.2014"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-188	EV00550348	EV00550357	Document entitled "Promotional Agreement"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; I; Y
DTX-189	EV00552765	EV00552766	March 17, 2015 email chain between H. West and R. Daga re: "EagleView Wall Report Case Study"	A; F; H; L; PK
DTX-190	EV00553619	EV00553619	Spreadsheet entitled "Non-Enterprise Pricing Analysis 6-19-2013"	A; F; L; PK; R; S
DTX-191	EV00555842	EV00555842	Document entitled "Important Ordering Process Change Notice for Xactimate Users"	A; F; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-192	EV00555999	EV00556028	Presentation entitled "EagleView Technologies 2014 Commercial Campaigns"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-193	EV00556147	EV556221	Document entitled "Roofing Contractor 2013 State of the Industry, December 2013, in conjunction with: GAF, EagleView Technologies"	A; F; H; L; PK

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-194	EV00556340	EV00556349	Document entitled "Affinity Program Agreement" between Pictometry and Owens Corning Sales LLC	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-195	EV00557667	EV00557710	Document entitled "Surveygizmo Summary Report - Auto Run, survey: CSAT and Quick Squares"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-196	EV00560010	EV00560053	Document entitled "Barclays For Your 'Information Services' Monthly A deep dive on VRSK's EVT deal; May credit issuance & macro updates, 4 June 2014"	A; F; H; L; PK
DTX-197	EV00562140	EV00562165	Document entitled "Q1 2013 Customer Satisfaction Survey, EagleView, Pictometry"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-198	EV00563069	EV00563069	Spreadsheet entitled "EV Order Volumes 2014 and 2015 by Source 9.21.2015"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-199	EV00563487	EV00563487	Document entitled "Pictometry Facts"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-200	EV00563668	EV00563687	Powerpoint entitled "Eagle View Technologies Commercial Business"	A; F; L; PK; R; C
DTX-201	EV00564980	EV00564981	Document entitled "What Low-cost Roof Reports Really Cost Carriers"	A; F; L; PK
DTX-202	EV00565683	EV00565702	PowerPoint entitled "EagleView Commercial Sales" by R. Daga	A; F; L; PK; R; C
DTX-203	EV00565708	EV00565742	Document entitled "IBIS World Industry Report 23816 Roofing Contractors in the US"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-204	EV00565878	EV00565898	Presentation entitled "EagleView Commercial Sales" by R. Daga	A; F; L; PK; R; C
DTX-205	EV00570761	EV00570763	October 31, 2013 email chain between A. Bowman and K. Cook, et al., re: "Xactimate email"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; I; P
DTX-206	EV00574954	EV00574989	Document entitled "EagleView Question and Answers"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-207	EV00576140	EV00576155	Document entitled "Roofing Contractor, State of the Industry Report - Economic Uncertainty Intensifies Focus on the Basics, by Chris King, January 30, 2013"	A; F; H; L; PK
DTX-208	EV00577312	EV00577314	February 8, 2016 email chain between R. Daga and D. Schultz, et al. re: "SkyMeasure aerial roof measurements"	PD; I; A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-209	EV00578906	EV00578906	Spreadsheet entitled "UHR Financial Model"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-210	EV00587056	EV00587059	Document entitled "Settlement Agreement and Release from Claims" between EagleView and Xactware, signed by C. Barrow March 29, 2016	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML
DTX-211	EV00587065	EV00587068	Document entitled "Settlement Agreement and Release from Claims" between EagleView and Xactware, signed by C. Barrow March 31, 2016	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML; C
DTX-212	EV00589848	EV00589890	Document entitled "EagleView Board of Directors' Meeting, January 17, 2015"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-213	EV00592347	EV00592349	Document entitled "Stuff that Keeps Me Up At Night 7/22/2015"	A; F; L; PK; R; P
DTX-214	EV00592350	EV00592352	August 3, 2015 email chain between C. Barrow and D. Schultz re: "Long one - Re: Stuff that keeps me up at night"	I; A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-215	EV00592898	EV00592902	Document entitled "Aerialogics"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; Y
DTX-216	EV00597098	EV00597104	<i>EagleView v. Xactware</i> , December 19, 2012, Order on Motion for Preliminary Injunction, W.D. Wa. 12-cv-01913-RSM	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML
DTX-217	EV00598366	EV00598422	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies Company Overview (June 2013), Chris Barrow, CEO"	A; F; L; PK; R; C
DTX-218	EV00598508	EV00598509	August 30, 2013 email chain between C. Barrow and B. Aoki, et al., re: "EagleVision -"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; Y; P
DTX-219	EV00614858	EV00614877	Document entitled "Eagle View Technologies, Inc. Consolidated Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2012 and 2011, and Independent Auditors' Report"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-220	EV00618955	EV00618955	Document entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation, Amendment to Common Stock Purchase Warrant"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-221	EV00621690	EV621737	PowerPoint entitled "Board of Director's Meeting, May 19, 2011"	A; F; L; PK; R; Y
DTX-222	EV00622171	EV00622175	Document entitled "Financial Summary"	A; F; L; PK; R; Y
DTX-223	EV00625436	EV00625460	<i>EagleView v. Xactware</i> , October 29, 2012, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, W.D. Wa. 12-cv-01913-RSM	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML
DTX-224	EV00645758	EV00645764	September 25, 2015 email chain between C. Barrow and J. Polchin, et al., re: "Consulting Agreement - Chris Pershing"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-225	EV00650923	EV00650926	October 6, 2015 email chain from A. Tsuchikawa to J. Polchin, et al. re: "Allied" and attachment thereto	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-226	EV00651598	EV00651598	Spreadsheet entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation - GAAP (Final) 09-30-2015"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-227	EV00695958	EV00695964	Document entitled "Employee Agreement" between EagleView Technologies, Inc. and Christopher Pershing	A; F; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-228	EV00695965	EV00695976	Document entitled "Employee Agreement" between EagleView Technologies, Inc. and David Carlson	A; F; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-229	EV00722590	EV00722600	Document entitled "Confidential Settlement Agreement" between Geospan Corporation and Pictometry	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-230	EV00726018	EV00726106	Document entitled "EagleView, Management Presentation, June 2015"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-231	EV00726805	EV00726805	Spreadsheet entitled "Xactware Analysis 03-31-16"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-232	EV00731048	EV00731107	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies, Inc. - Fair Market Value of a Minority Common Stock Interest As of September 30, 2011"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-233	EV00732307	EV00732317	Executed "Agreement" of November 3, 2008 between Xactware Solutions, Inc. and Eagle View Technologies, Inc.	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; ML
DTX-234	EV00736743	EV00736745	December 8, 2008 email chain between C. Barrow and J. Gauger re: "Eagleview"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-235	EV00744383	EV00744386	Document entitled "Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims" signed by C. Barrow on March 29, 2016	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML; C
DTX-236	EV00752169	EV00752175	PowerPoint entitled "EV Extended Coverage Strategy"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-237	EV00754363	EV00754365	March 1, 2010 email chain between P. Gamido and R. Daga, et al. re: "prelim questions"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-238	EV00758496	EV00758606	Document entitled "EagleView, Pictometry, Overview, 2013"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-239	EV00759471	EV00759471	September 28, 2013 email from R. Daga to C. Barrow; D. Shultz; H. Ellsworth; J. Polchin re: "QS"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-240	EV00762624	EV00762624	Spreadsheet entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation Monthly Financials with Adjusted EBITDA"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-241	EV00770811	EV00770882	Document entitled: "Confidential Information Memorandum, EagleView... July 2015, Morgan Stanley, Nomura"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-242	EV00774134	EV00774166	PowerPoint entitled "Eagleview Corporate Presentation- January 2015"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-243	EV00777760	EV00777804	PowerPoint entitled "Eagleview Corporate Presentation- January 2015"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-244	EV00778819	EV00778820	Document entitled "Amendment NO. 2 to Schedule 1, dated February 3, 2014"	I; A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-245	EV00781520	EV00781560	Document entitled "Project Phoenix 5/26 Meeting Summary, May 25, 2015"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML
DTX-246	EV00781564	EV00781604	Document entitled "Project Phoenix 5/26 Meeting Summary, May 25, 2015"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; P; ML; C
DTX-247	EV00790169	EV00790181	Executed Master Services Agreement- between EagleView and Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co.	A; F; H; L; LF; PK
DTX-248	EV00790182	EV00790182	Executed Amendment to Master Service Agreement between Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company and EagleView	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; I
DTX-249	EV00797041	EV797043	March 13, 2014 email from C. Barrow to J. Polchin re: "Ashley Complaint" and attaching "Ashley Complaint"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; I; P
DTX-250	EV00811069	EV00811075	July 2, 2010 email chain between P. Durisko and R. Daga, et al., re: "MSA/SOW follow up" and attaching document entitled "EV Allstate SOW.pdf; EV Allstate MSA.pdf"	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R;
DTX-251	EV00839085	EV00839089	August 1, 2012 email from L. Hill to J. Polchin; H. Guarin; cc: HICKSA, re: "The Eagle View Amendment - Aerial Roof Reports (RC-16740) (between John R. Polchin, HERMES GUARIN and Lori Hill) is Signed and Filed!" and attaching document entitled "Eagle View Amendment - Aerial Roof Reports (RC-16740) - signed.pdf"	A; F; H; R
DTX-252	EV00840490	EV00840490	Spreadsheet entitled "Eagleview Technologies 3YR FINANCIAL MODEL Deloitte Update 12 2 2012"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-253	EV00845839	EV00845839	Spreadsheet entitled "Eagleview Technologies 3YR FINANCIAL MODEL 07.10.12 (Update.v2.4)"	A; F; H; R; P; C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-254	EV00854689	EV00854691	Document entitled "Weekly Status Update 4/15/11, F. Giuffrida"	A; F; H; I; R; P
DTX-255	EV00915895	EV00915930	PowerPoint entitled "GeoEstimator, Presentation, November 4, 2009"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-256	EV00916061	EV00916061	Spreadsheet entitled "Authorized Invoice Customers IA Discount Programs - 10-25-12"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-257	EV00923530	EV00923706	PowerPoint entitled "EagleView/Pictometry Corporate Identity Recommendations Workshop, May 15, 2013"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-258	EV00992796	EV00992797	December 13, 2017 email chain between R. Daga, "Exec Team", B. Aoki, et al. re: "Fw: Aerialogics Measurement services out of business"	A; H; R
DTX-259	EV01096538	EV01096604	PowerPoint entitled "Marketing Update - National Sales Meeting, October 2011, Pictometry"	A; F; R; P
DTX-260	EV01150680	EV01150684	May 1, 2012 email from F. Giuffrida to R. Hurwitz, re: "EV Notes 4-28-12" and attaching document entitled "EV Notes 4-28-12.doc"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-261	EV01151193	EV01151210	Executed "Roof Report License Agreement" between Pictometry and Accurrence, Inc.	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-262	EV01236867	EV01236899	Document entitled "Contract/Award" between Pictometry International Corp. and US Homeland Security	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-263	EV01255008	EV01255246	Document entitled "Xactimate User's Guide Version 27"	A; H; C
DTX-264	EV01261027	EV01261068	PowerPoint entitled "Project Aerial, Advent International, Discussion document, May 15, 2012, McKinsey&Company"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-265	EV01285476	EV01285617	PowerPoint entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation BOD Presentation, Austin, TC, 03 March, 2016"	F; H; R; P; C; MIL
DTX-266	EV01371936	EV01371963	Document entitled "Investor Roadshow, December 2014"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-267	EV01424840	EV01424916	PowerPoint entitled "EagleView Technology Corporation BOD Presentation, San Francisco, CA, 27 October, 2015"	F; R; P; C
DTX-268	EV01424917	EV01424937	PowerPoint entitled "EagleView Technologies, Commercial Business, RD"	F; R; P; C
DTX-269	EV01426960	EV01426994	November 13, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	F; R; C
DTX-270	EV01426999	EV01427033	November 13, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	F; R; C
DTX-271	EV01427067	EV01427100	October 15, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	F; R; C
DTX-272	EV01427118	EV01427136	October 15, 2008, Document entitled "Set Reference Plane"	F; R; C; I
DTX-273	EV01427157	EV01427190	October 15, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	F; R; C
DTX-274	EV01427191	EV01427224	October 15, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	F; R; C
DTX-275	EV01427240	EV01427274	November 13, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	F; R; C
DTX-276	EV01427321	EV01427354	October 15, 2008, Document entitled "Eagle View Reference Guide: For Measuring Technicians"	F; R; C
DTX-277	EV01427937	EV01427937	Spreadsheet entitled "Summary Revenue Analysis FY2009 to FY2012 (monthly details)"	A; F
DTX-278	EV01427938	EV01427938	Spreadsheet entitled "FY2014 YTD Summary Revenue Analysis (monthly details) - ADJ Industry Mix"	A; F
DTX-279	EV01494112	EV01494112	Spreadsheet entitled "Disputed Report Tracker"	A; F; H; R; P
DTX-280	EV01528243	EV01528244	Document entitled "EagleView Total Satisfaction Guarantee"	F; H; R
DTX-281	EV01550635	EV01550752	August 19, 2008 Letter from D. Carlson to P. Moreno re: "Bid Posting on GetaFreelancer.com and similar sites Infringement of Eagle View Technologies' Intellectual Property Seed IP Ref.: 290115.802"	A; F; H; R; P; I; C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-282	EV01552476	EV01552477	Document entitled "Eagle View's Report Revenue P&L Analysis - Insurance Reports Only"	A; F
DTX-283	EV01552910	EV01552911	BLOM webpage - 3D modeling & visualization	A; F; H; R; C
DTX-284	EV01552967	EV01552973	Cyclomedia webpage- Software & Services	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-285	EV01553209	EV01553214	Parabolic Arc webpage- EADS Reorganized, Acknowledges Success of SpaceX	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-286	EV01553215	EV01553217	Planet Labs webpage - Products	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-287	EV01553218	EV01553221	Solarspectrum webpage- "About Us"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-288	EV01553222	EV01553224	Sungevity webpage- "About Us"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-289	EV01553466	EV01553466	Spreadsheet entitled "Income Statement: Functional 2017 ADJ - New From Jan 2017 to Oct 2017"	A; F; H
DTX-290	EV01553468	EV01553469	Aerialogics webpage- Roofing	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-291	EV01553470	EV01553471	GeoEstimator webpage	A; F; H; R; P; C; I; ML
DTX-292	EV01553472	EV01553473	Autodesk webpage- Autodesk ImageModeler	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-293	EV01553474	EV01553475	Autodesk webpage- Autodesk ImageModeler; Customer Showcase	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-294	EV01553476	EV01553478	PhotoModeler webpage- Standard Product Overview	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-295	EV01553479	EV01553480	PhotoModeler webpage- PhotoModeler UAS Product Overview	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-296	EV01553481	EV01553481	Pictometry International Webpage- "Three Invaluable Reports. At Affordable Prices"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-297	EV01553482	EV01553483	Precigeo Webpage- Announcing new prices and discount programs	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-298	EV01553484	EV01553486	RoofShots Print out	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-299	EV01553487	EV01553487	Roofers411.com homepage	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-300	EV01553488	EV01553488	Roofers411.com webpage- showing "Member Pricing"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-301	EV01553489	EV01553489	Roofers411.com webpage- "Comparing Apples to Apples"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-302	EV01553490	EV01553491	Roofscope.com webpage- showing subscription prices	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-303	EV01553492	EV01553503	Roofscope.com webpage- measuring	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-304	EV01553504	EV01553506	Roofshots webpage- showing subscription prices and details	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-305	EV01553507	EV01553507	Roofwalk.com webpage- depicting costs	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-306	EV01553508	EV01553523	CoreLogic webpage	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-307	EV01553524	EV01553539	CoreLogic webpage	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-308	EV01553540	EV01553540	Skytekimaging Webpage- "Pricing"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-309	EV01553541	EV01553542	Skytekimaging Webpage- "Pricing"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-310	EV01553543	EV01553544	Skytekimaging Webpage- "Pricing"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-311	EV01553545	EV01553545	Document entitled "Skytek Imaging: Save Money, Make More Sales! Best Value In the Industry!"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-312	EV01553547	EV01553549	February 2, 2009 letter from D. Carlson to D. Thornberry re: "Infringement of Eagle View Technologies' Intellectual Property Seed IP Ref.: 290115.807"	A; F; H; R; P; I; C
DTX-313	EV01553593	EV01553595	February 10, 2009 letter from D. Lueders, Esq. to D. Carlson re: "Infringement Allegations by EagleView Technologies Our Re.: 20283-12"	A; F; H; R; P; I; C
DTX-314	EV01553596	EV01553598	February 27, 2009 letter from D. Carlson to D. Lueders, Esq. re: "Infringement of Eagle View Technologies' Intellectual Property Seed IP Ref.: 290115.807"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-315	EV01553683	EV01553683	Spreadsheet entitled "Income Statement: Functional ADJ - New Feb 2018"	A; F
DTX-316	EV01553684	EV01553684	Spreadsheet entitled "Income Statement: Natural ADJ - Nov 2017, Dec 2017, Jan 2018, Feb 2018"	F; H; R
DTX-317	EV01553685	EV01553685	Spreadsheet with tabs entitled "insurance" and "contractor"	F; H
DTX-318	EV01553686	EV01553688	Document entitled "Amendment No. 4 to the Liberty Mutual Satellite/Aerial Imagery Roof Services Agreement dated July 24, 2009 between Eagle View Technologies, Inc. and Liberty Mutual Insurance Company"	F; H
DTX-319	EV01553689	EV01553731	Document entitled "Master Services Agreement" between Famers Insurance Exchange and Eagle View	F; H
DTX-320	EV01553732	EV01553732	Spreadsheet entitled "Report Revenue P&L Analysis"	F; H; R
DTX-321	EV01553734	EV01553737	Document entitled "Change Order #1 to Statement of Work" between American Family Mutual Insurance Company, S.I. and Eagle View	A; F; H; R; I

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-322	EV00731108	EV00731168	Document entitled "EagleView Technologies Inc. Fair Market Value of a Minority Common Stock Interest as of December 31, 2011, report issued: June 12, 2012"	F; II; 105
DTX-323	N/A	N/A	Appendix A: matrix Algebra Library for Flash MX ActionScript: Creating and printing matrices by R. Chris Fraley	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-324	N/A	N/A	Pershing Declaration Under C.F.R. §1.131 re Application No. 12/148,439 for Aerial Roof Estimation System and Method	
DTX-325	XW00001011	XW00001033	Provisional Patent Application 60/925,072 for Aerial Roof Estimation System and Method	R, P, C
DTX-326	EV00036928	EV00036941	U.S. Patent Application Publication 2008/0262789 entitled, "Aerial Roof Estimation System and Method"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-327	EV00042134	EV00042151	U.S. Patent No. 8,145,578 entitled, "Aerial Roof Estimation System and Method"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-328	EV00027998	EV00028487	WIPO WO 2006/040775 entitled, "Computational Solution of an Building of Three Dimensional Virtual Models from Aerial Photographs"	R, P, ML
DTX-329	N/A	N/A	CV of Geoff A Cohen, PhD	H; C; P
DTX-330	N/A	N/A	CV of Joseph Mundy, PhD	H; C; P
DTX-331	N/A	N/A	CV of Philip Green	H; C; P
DTX-332	XW00942418	XW00942497	R. Hartley and A. Zisserman, Multiple View Geometry, Cambridge University Press, 2000, excerpts	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-333	N/A	N/A	Exhibit A to April 11, 2018 Expert Report of Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D	H; C; P
DTX-334	N/A	N/A	Exhibit B to April 11, 2018 Expert Report of Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D	H; C; P
DTX-335	N/A	N/A	Exhibit A to May 23, 2018 Expert Report of Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D	H; C; P
DTX-336	N/A	N/A	Exhibit B to May 23, 2018 Expert Report of Geoff A. Cohen, Ph.D	H; C; P
DTX-337	N/A	N/A	Appendix C claim constructions agreed to by parties	I; C
DTX-338	N/A	N/A	Corrected Request for Supplemental Exam of Claims 1-56 of Us Patent 436	P; I; C
DTX-339	EV454700	EV454706	Declaration of Chris Barrow, Dkt. 4, EagleView v. Xactware, W.D. Wa. Case: 12-cv-01913	ML; R; P; C
DTX-340	USAA.001548	USAA.001558	Document entitled "Statement of Work January 2010"	F; H
DTX-341	USAA.002394	USAA.002397	July 20, 2009 email chain between S. Semian and K. Desormeaux, et al., re: "EagleView"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-342	VISTA-00000727	VISTA00000753	Document entitled "Vista Equity Partners, Investment Committee Presentation, EagleView Technologies, Inc., May 29, 2015"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-343	VISTA-00002227	VISTA00002233	May 9, 2015 email from D. Sullivan to J. Hicket, et al. re: "Project Phoenix - Consolidated Expert Call Ntes" and attachments thereto	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-344	XW00000001	XW00000001	October 20, 2015 Email chain to K. Lew from J.Taylor re: "FW: Co Planarity assessment and planning"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-345	XW00000002	XW00000007	Document entitled "Resolution of Co-planarity issues"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-346	XW00000008	XW00000011	October 20, 2015 email between J. Taylor and K. Lew, et al, re: "FW: Conquering coplanarity issues"	A; F; H; R; P; C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-347	XW00000012	XW00000012	Spreadsheet entitled "Sprint Planning"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-348	XW00000998	XW00001010	Document entitled "Scene Registration in Aerial Image Analysis" by Frederic P. Perlant, et al.	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-349	XW00001011	XW00001033	April 17, 2007 "Filing Receipt" for USPTO application 60/925,072	A; F; H; R; P; C; I
DTX-350	XW00001034	XW00001276	August 31, 2015 "Publication Notice" for USPTO application 14/841,523	A; F; H; R; P; C; I
DTX-351	XW00001277	XW00001320	U.S. Patent Application No. 2015/0370929 A1 by C.Pershing	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-352	XW00001321	XW00001483	Document entitled "Able Software Corp. R2V for Windows (9X, NT, 2000, ME), R2V for Windows User's Manual"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-353	XW00001484	XW00001515	Document entitled "Detection and Modeling of Buildings from Multiple Aerial Images" (Noronha)	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-354	XW00001516	XW00001598	November 1995, Document entitled "Design and Evaluation of a Semi-Automated Site Modeling System" (Hsieh)	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-355	XW00001599	XW00001599	Spreadsheet entitled "Sprint Planning"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-356	XW00001600	XW00002936	November 13, 2015, Document entitled "Request for Certificate of Correction" for U.S. Patent No. 8,078,436 C1	
DTX-357	XW00002937	XW00002948	U.S. Patent No. 5,422,989 to Bell et al.	R; P; C; ML
DTX-358	XW00002949	XW00003807	Document entitled "Aerial Roof Estimation Systems and Methods, Cross Reference to Related Applications"	R; P; C
DTX-359	XW00004908	XW00005072	File History to US Patent No. 8,542,880	R; P; C
DTX-360	XW00005073	XW00005102	U.S. Patent No. 8,542,880 to Thornberry	R; P; C
DTX-361	XW00007794	XW00007809	US Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0061566 to Verma, et al.	R; P; C; ML
DTX-362	XW00007810	XW00007828	U.S. Patent No. 8,145,578 to Pershing	R; P; C
DTX-363	XW00007829	XW00008083	Document entitled "Xactimate v.25 Users Guide"	H; P; C
DTX-364	XW00008084	XW00008357	Document entitled "Xactimate v.25 Users Guide"	H; P; C
DTX-365	XW00008358	XW00008365	Document entitled "Geo-Spatial Aerial Video Processing for Scene Understanding and Object Tracking"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-366	XW00008366	XW00008382	November 2007, Document entitled "Registration of Challenging Image Pairs: Initialization, Estimation, and Decision"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-367	XW00008383	XW00008406	2003, Document entitled "Image registration methods: a survey"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-368	XW00016970	XW00016985	PowerPoint entitled "Xactimate online"	H; R; P; C
DTX-369	XW00018936	XW00018939	Document entitled "Xactimate - Product Marketing Transition to Dustin"	H; R; P; C
DTX-370	XW00018940	XW00018970	PowerPoint entitled "Xactware"	H; R; P; C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-371	XW00019758	XW00019760	Document entitled "What's New in Xactimate"	H; R; P; C
DTX-372	XW00020137	XW00020160	Document entitled "Xactimate 28 Aerial Sketch"	H; R; P; C
DTX-373	XW00020330	XW00020333	2006, Document entitled "Automatic 3D Roof Reconstruction using Digital Cadastral Map, Architectural Knowledge and and Aerial Image"	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-374	XW00020334	XW00020414	U.S. Patent No. 6,448,964 to Isaacs, et al.	R; P; C; ML
DTX-375	XW00020415	XW00020465	U.S. Patent No. 7,920,963 to Jouline, et al.	R; P; C; ML
DTX-376	XW00020466	XW00020483	May 2001, Document entitled "Detection and Modeling of Buildings from Multiple Aerial Images" (Noronha)	H; PK; ML
DTX-377	XW00020484	XW00020502	McKeown, et al., Chapter Feature Extraction and Object Recognition - Automatic Cartographic Feature Extraction Using Photogrammetric Principles, Digital Photogrammetry: An Addendum to the Manual of Photogrammetry	H; PK; ML
DTX-378	XW00020486	XW00020502	McKeown, et al., Chapter Feature Extraction and Object Recognition - Automatic Cartographic Feature Extraction Using Photogrammetric Principles, Digital Photogrammetry: An Addendum to the Manual of Photogrammetry	H; PK; ML
DTX-379	XW00020503	XW00020528	U.S. Patent Application Publication 2007/0220174 by Abhnyanker	C; ML
DTX-380	XW00020529	XW00020529	March 18, 2013 Document entitled "Affidavit Attesting to the Accuracy of the Attached 'Aerowest' Translation Under 37 C.F.R. Section 42.2, 42.63(b), and/or 1.68"	H; PK; ML
DTX-381	XW00020530	XW00020550	Document entitled "Aerowest - translation"	H; PK; ML
DTX-382	XW00020551	XW00020596	November 2002, Document entitled "Appli-cad: World Class Technology Leading the Way in Roofing Software"	H; PK; ML
DTX-383	XW00020597	XW00020601	September 2006, Document entitled "Interactive Detection of 3D Models of Building's Roofing For the Estimation of the Solar Energy Potential"	H; PK; ML
DTX-384	XW00020602	XW00020607	August 2005, "Extraction of 3D Spatial Poly Gons Based on the Overlapping Criterion for Roof Extraction from Aerial Images"	H; PK; ML
DTX-385	XW00020608	XW00021143	Document entitled "Electronic Field Study User Guide, Version 2.7, July 2007, Pictometry"	H; PK; C
DTX-386	XW00021144	XW00021150	Document entitled "EP 1010966 B1Description"	A; H; PK; 1002; ML
DTX-387	XW00021151	XW00021162	Document entitled "Europäische Patentschrift"	A; PK; F; ML
DTX-388	XW00021163	XW00021979	September 25, 2015, Document entitled "Change in Entity Status" for U.S. Patent 8,145,578 to Pershing	H; PK; P; R; C; 1002; X
DTX-389	XW00021980	XW00021987	Document entitled "Image Snapping, Michael Gleicher, Advanced Technology Group, Apple Computer, Inc."	H; C; PK
DTX-390	XW00021998	XW00022008	Document entitled "ISPRS Data Integration: Systems and Techniques, July 13th - 17th, 1998"	H; PK; ML
DTX-391	XW00022009	XW00022041	U.S. Patent No. 8,401,222 to Thornberry, et al.	R, P, C
DTX-392	XW00022042	XW00022071	U.S. Patent No. 8,542,880 to Thornberry, et al.	R, P, C
DTX-393	XW00022072	XW00022090	U.S. Patent No. 8,823,732 to Adams et al.	R, P, C
DTX-394	XW00022091	XW00022580	Document entitled "Change in Entity Status" related to U.S. Patent No. 8,170,840	H; PK; P; R; C; 1002; X

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-395	XW00029402	XW00029699	Document entitled "Xactimate 28 Fundamentals & Proficiency"	H; PK
DTX-396	XW00049554	XW00049568	Document entitled "Xactware Aerial Imagery Capture Specs"	H; PK
DTX-397	XW00049771	XW00049777	January 30, 2012 email from J. Taylor to Z. Smith; KC Agrelius re: "Meeting with Pictometry"	H, F
DTX-398	XW00059701	XW00059705	September 10, 2013 email chain between J. Taylor, J. Lewis, M. Olson, et al. re: "FW: InSight Results"	H; 1002; C
DTX-399	XW00059958	XW00059967	Document entitled "Property InSight Mass Production Workflow Overview"	H; PK
DTX-400	XW00060775	XW00060788	PowerPoint entitled "Xactware 2011 Retreat - Xactimate SWOT, Customer Perspective"	H; PK; P
DTX-401	XW00068697	XW00068704	Document entitled "Version 2, June 24, 2015, Xactware Marketing Plan, Property Insight"	H; PK
DTX-402	XW00075375	XW00075375	Spreadsheet entitled "Copy of Business Plan - Sep 2013 CDH adds"	H; PK
DTX-403	XW00075886	XW00075888	December 22, 201, email chain between E. Webecke, V. Zabavsky, et al. re: "Project Aerial Synergies"	H, R, P, C
DTX-404	XW00077433	XW00077440	September 30, 2012 Executed "Amendment No. 1 to Master Product License and Service Agreement" between Xactware and Allstate Insurance Co.	C; H; P; R
DTX-405	XW00077754	XW00077764	Document entitled "Fifth Amendment to Master Services Agreement No. 983024 Order No. 1, Nationwide Agreement No. 983024" between Xactware and Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co.	C; H; P; R
DTX-406	XW00078361	XW00078361	Spreadsheet entitled "Project Aerial Financial Model v1"	H; PK
DTX-407	XW00078740	XW00078742	July 1, 2014 email chain between M. King and B. Carroll, et al. re: "Itemization of USAA Intelligent Method of Inspection Project Bid..Mike King, please take a look"	C; H; P; R
DTX-408	XW00078956	XW00079000	Unexecuted "Master Product License Agreement" between Xactware and Farmers Insurance Exchange	H; PK; 1002; c
DTX-409	XW00079741	XW00079806	Unexecuted "Master Services, Software License and Maintenance Agreement with Xactware Solutions, Inc." between Xactware and United Services Automobile Association	H; PK; 1002; c
DTX-410	XW00079998	XW00080005	Executed "Commercial License Agreement" between Pictometry and Xactware	H
DTX-411	XW00080519	XW00080609	Executed "Master Product License and Service Agreement" between Xactware and AllState Insurance Company	H; PK
DTX-412	XW00080884	XW00080891	Executed "License Agreement" between Xactware and Accurrence	H; PK
DTX-413	XW00085033	XW00085038	Document entitled "Verisk Products Overview"	H; PK
DTX-414	XW00085059	XW00085061	March 5, 2014 email chain between S. Stephenson, V. Zabavsky, et al. re: "Project Aerial - January results, revenue detail, report deliveries"	H, R, P, C
DTX-415	XW00087413	XW00087417	March 2, 2015 email chain between C. Hopper and E. Quiones, et. al re: "CoreLogic Roof Imagery Offering"	H, R, P, C
DTX-416	XW00087418	XW00087418	Spreadsheet entitled "Feature Comparison"	H; PK
DTX-417	XW00088661	XW00088666	Unexecuted "Term Sheet" between Xactware and SkyTek	H; C; R; P; 1002
DTX-418	XW00094058	XW00094058	Spreadsheet entitled "I08984"	H; PK; C; P
DTX-419	XW00105725	XW00105725	Spreadsheet entitled "I63308"	H; PK; C; P
DTX-420	XW00110853	XW00110857	July 9, 2012, email chain between J. Loveland and W. Raichle, et al. re: "PIR Conference Sessions"	H, R, P, C
DTX-421	XW00111096	XW00111102	Document entitled "Aerial Sketch Fulfillment Business Plan"	H; PK

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-422	XW00112508	XW00112539	PowerPoint entitled "Aerial Imagery - How it serves our industry"	H; PK
DTX-423	XW00116432	XW00116432	Spreadsheet entitled "Business Plan - Sep 2013 v9"	H; PK
DTX-424	XW00126602	XW00126626	Power Point entitled "Aerotriangulation September 2015"	H; PK
DTX-425	XW00204344	XW00204381	PowerPoint entitled "2013 Management Retreat"	H; PK
DTX-426	XW00212308	XW00212389	Document entitled "Xactware Monthly Business Review, April 2012"	H; PK
DTX-427	XW00212561	XW00212561	Spreadsheet entitled "InSight"	H; PK
DTX-428	XW00213949	XW00213954	Unexecuted "Amendment No. 2 to Master Product License and Service Agreement" between Xactware and Allstate Insurance	H; PK; 1002
DTX-429	XW00214262	XW00214268	Document entitled "Draft - Oct. 29, 2014, Term Sheet" between SkyTek and Xactware	H; PK; 1002; P; C
DTX-430	XW00214588	XW00214600	Document entitled "Opportunity Assessment, EagleView Technologies, May 9, 2012" with Redline	H; PK; 1002; P; C
DTX-431	XW00214753	XW00214759	Document entitled "Draft - Oct. 24, 2014, Term Sheet" between SkyTek and Xactware	H; PK; 1002; P; C
DTX-432	XW00215027	XW00215126	Document entitled "Xactware Monthly Business Review July 2013"	H; PK
DTX-433	XW00215288	XW00215288	Spreadsheet entitled "Q4 2012 Monthly Financial Summary with Intercompany from Dionne Clarke"	H; PK; P; C
DTX-434	XW00215294	XW00215294	Spreadsheet entitled "Spec 19 Competitors"	H; C; P
DTX-435	XW00217085	XW00217128	Document entitled "Property InSight Mass Production Tool User Guide"	H; C; P
DTX-436	XW00218331	XW00218340	Document entitled "Introduction"	H; C; PK; I
DTX-437	XW00233200	XW00233200	Spreadsheet entitled "Aerial Imagery Providers-Users"	H; C; PK
DTX-438	XW00234657	XW00234658	May 13, 2013 email chain between J. Taylor, B. Carroll, et al., re: "AAA Webex on Property Insight"	H; C; P
DTX-439	XW00238080	XW00238083	April 19, 2013, Letter from E. Webecke to M. Barrows re: "Notice of On-Site Audit, Notice of Materials breach and Notice of Failure to Perform as Provided under the Agreement"	H; C; P
DTX-440	XW00238771	XW00238778	Document entitled "Draft - Dec. 3, 2014, Term Sheet" between SkyTek and Xactware	H; C; PK; 1002
DTX-441	XW00239427	XW00239473	Executed "Master Product License and Services Agreement" between Xactware and Travelers	H; C
DTX-442	XW00241411	XW00241413	January 27, 2015 email chain between J. Loveland and C. Barrow re: "Litigation Settlement Business Discussions"	H; P; R
DTX-443	XW00247642	XW00247697	<i>EagleView v. Xactware (W.D.Wa 12-cv-01913)</i> , May 2, 2013, Declaration of John Tondini in Support of Defendants Motion for Order Requiring That Eagle View Show Cause Why it Should Not be Held in Contempt, and exhibits thereto	H; C; P; 1002; F; ML
DTX-444	XW00292033	XW00292034	Unexecuted "Amendment to Agreement" between Xactware and Eagle View	H; C; A; F
DTX-445	XW00302467	XW00302468	January 7, 2009, Email to J. Loveland et al., from J. Taylor re: "Eagle View Agenda"	H; C; P
DTX-446	XW00352973	XW00352973	Spreadsheet entitled "Geomni - Financials v1.0"	H; A; 1002; PK
DTX-447	XW00356612	XW00356613	May 14, 2008, Email to J. Loveland, et al. from J. Taylor re: "Roof estimates in 2007"	H; A; P
DTX-448	XW00373793	XW00373834	PowerPoint entitled "Project Aerial, Discussion document, May 15, 2012"	H; R; C; P; PK
DTX-449	XW00389435	XW00389437	August, 24, 2016 Document, entitled "Declaration of Lynn Berard"	H; A; PK; F; P
DTX-450	XW00389438	XW00389521	November 1995, Document entitled "Design and Evaluation of a Semi-Automated Site Modeling System" (Hsieh)	H; A; PK; F; ML

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-451	XW00389522	XW00389605	Document entitled "Xactware Solutions, Inc., Exhibit 1003 Inter Partes Review of US Patent No 8,825,454" (Hsieh)	H; A; PK; F; P; C; X; I; ML
DTX-452	XW00389606	XW00389694	Document entitled "Xactware Solutions, Inc. Corrected Exhibit 1008 Xactware v. Eagle View IPR 2016-01775" (Corrected Berard Declaration)	H; A; PK; F; P; C; X; I; ML
DTX-453	XW00389695	XW00389744	January 8, 2016, Document entitled "Affidavit of Christopher Butler" with Appli-cad	C; H; ML
DTX-454	XW00389745	XW00389842	Document entitled "Xactware Solutions Inc. Corrected Exhibit 1005 Inter Partes Review of US Patent No. 8,078,436" (Appli-cad)	H; A; PK; F; P; C; X; I; ML
DTX-455	XW00418610	XW00418675	Executed "Master Services Software License, and Maintenance Agreement with Xactware Solutions, Inc." between United Services Automobile Association and Xactware	H; A; C
DTX-456	XW00451293	XW00451293	Spreadsheet entitled "XWARE Statement of Monthly Revenues-June 2016 7.12.16"	H; A; C; PK
DTX-457	XW00513561	XW00513561	Spreadsheet entitled "Year over Year 2015 Charts DJG"	H; A; C; PK
DTX-458	XW00521280	XW00521280	Spreadsheet entitled "Xactware Analysis 06-30-16"	H; A; C; PK
DTX-459	XW00608758	XW00608805	PowerPoint entitled "P&C Insurance Trends" by Verisk Analytics	C; H
DTX-460	XW00660553	XW00660553	Copy of Manual of Photogrammetry, 5th Ed., McGlone (hard copy of book)	R; C; NR; NT; X; ML
DTX-461	XW00660576	XW00660848	U.S. Patent App. 12/364506 FH by Sungevity, Inc.	A; F; H; R; C; ML
DTX-462	XW00939981	XW00939981	Spreadsheet entitled "Priority Company"	A; C; F; H
DTX-463	XW00940428	XW00940428	Executed "Master Product License and Services Agreement Schedule 3" between Travelers Indemnity and Xactware	H; R
DTX-464	XW00940726	XW00940791	Executed "Master Services, Software License, and Maintenance Agreement with Xactware Solutions, Inc." between United Services Automobile Association and Xactware	H; R; C; P. PK
DTX-465	XW00941300	XW00941300	Spreadsheet entitled "StatsResults"	H; R; C; P. PK; F; Dem Only
DTX-466	XW00941700	XW00942352	Document entitled "Methods and Systems for Provisioning Energy Systems"	H; C; F
DTX-467	XW00942354	XW00942354	Spreadsheet entitled "requests"	H; R; C; P. PK; F; Dem Only
DTX-468	XW00942356	XW00942356	Spreadsheet entitled "Statement of revenues monthly"	H; A; C; PK
DTX-469	XW00942357	XW00942357	Spreadsheet of Geomni Monthly Revenue and Expenses	H; A; C; PK
DTX-470	XW00942358	XW00942358	Spreadsheet entitled "stats_allmovement_tools"	H; R; C; P. PK; F; Dem Only
DTX-471	XW00942359	XW00942361	Screenshots of Operation Software	H; F; R; PK; C
DTX-472	XW00942362	XW00942366	Screenshots from Mundy Report	H; F; R; PK; C
DTX-473	XW00942371	XW00942371	Document entitled "FYI; GEOestimator And Pictometry Merge" from www.contractortalk.com/f15/fyi-geoestimator-pictometry-merge-99087/ last accessed March 18, 2018	H; R; P; C; PK; A
DTX-474	XW00000013	XW00000064	Documents related to Sketch Aerial Image Instructions	A; Cmpd; F; H; L; LF; PK; R

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-475	EV00033728	EV00033877	May 29, 2012 Amended Complaint, and exhibits thereto, filed in <i>Eagle View Technologies, Inc. v. Aerialogics, LLC</i> (W.D.Wa 12-cv-00618-RAJ)	A; F; H; L; LF; P; PK; R; ML
DTX-476	EV00034499	EV00034585	April 5, 2012 Amended Complaint, and exhibits thereto, filed in <i>EagleView v. RoofWalk</i> (W.D.Wa 12-cv-00544)	A; F; H; L; LF; P; PK; R; ML
DTX-477	EV00034640	EV00034777	June 4, 2012 Second Amended Complaint, and exhibits thereto, filed in <i>EagleView v. RoofWalk</i> (W.D.Wa 12-cv-00544)	A; F; H; L; PK; ML
DTX-478	XW00395033	XW00395035	April 6, 2012 email from F. Coyne to J. Loveland re: "EagleView"	A; H; L; LF; PK
DTX-479	XW00238956	XW00238957	March 8, 2012 email chain between E. Webecke, J. Loveland, and R. Johnson re: "EagleView FUD at Travelers"	A; H; L; LF; PK
DTX-480	EV00775747	EV00775915	January 14, 2014 document entitled "Agreement and Plan of Merger" between Verisk, Insurance Services Officer, ISO Merger SUB I, EagleView, and Fortis Advisors	A; F; H; L; PK
DTX-481	EV00792365	EV00792454	Document entitled "Disclosure Schedule" to Agreement and Plan of Merger between Verisk, Insurance Services Officer, ISO Merger SUB I, EagleView, and Fortis Advisors	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-482	EV00475324	EV00475428	June 15, 2015 document entitled "Agreement and Plan of Merger" between Phoenix Holdco, Phoenix Merger SUB, EagleView, and Fortis Advisors	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-483	EV00476017	EV00476337	Document entitled "Disclosure Schedule" to Agreement and Plan of Merger between Phoenix Holdco, Phoenix Merger SUB, EagleView, and Fortis Advisors	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R
DTX-484	EV00475857	EV00475879	Document entitled "Exhibit A – Certain Definitions" to Agreement and Plan of Merger between Phoenix Holdco, Phoenix Merger SUB, EagleView, and Fortis Advisors	A; F; H; L; LF; PK; R; I
DTX-485	XW00664654	XW00664654	Sketch (.skt) file	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R
DTX-486	XW00942509	XW00942514	U.S. Patent No. 510,758 to C. B. Adams (1893).	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML
DTX-487	XW00942372	XW00942417	S. Finsterwalder, "Die Geometrischen Grundlagen Der Photogrammetrie" in Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung, Berlin (1899)	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML
DTX-488	XW00942369	XW00942370	"Digital Orthophotos", U.S. Geological Survey (Feb. 1993)	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML
DTX-489	XW00384370	XW00384372	Document entitled "Design and evaluation of a semi-automated site modeling system"	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML
DTX-490	XW00384373	XW00384374	February 1999 document entitled "005 - Date and Time of Latest Transaction (NR)"	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML
DTX-491	XW00942498	XW00942508	A. Heller et al, The Site-Model Construction Component of the RADIUS Testbed System, Proc. ARPA Image Understanding Workshop, Palm Springs, CA, 1996	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML
DTX-492	EV370320	EV370358	November 5, 2011 email from J. Polchin to J. Michael et al re: "NDA" and attachments thereto	A, F; H; R, P, C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-493	EV539585	EV539593	December 22, 2015 email chain between T. Kellner, D. Owens, and M. Quilter re: "Equity Valuation" and attachments thereto	PD; I; A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-494	EV737497	EV737570	December 18, 2008 email from C. Barrow to Y. Pikover, et al re: "Board Materials" and attachments thereto	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-495	VISTA-00000490	VISTA-00001248	May 26, 2015 email from D. Sullivan, to T. Kellner, S. White attaching "EagleView Technologies, Inc. Investment Summary"	A; F; H; R; P; C; ML
DTX-496	VISTA-00001238	VISTA-00001243	June 4, 2015 email chain between D. Sullivan and T. Kellner attaching "Project Phoenix – Debt Financing Call Notes (6/3/15)"	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML; P; I
DTX-497	VISTA-00001889	VISTA-00001896	June 10, 2015 email from D. Sullivan to A. Tate, T. Kellner, and S. White attaching "Contractor Survey Results (102 Completed)"	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; ML; P; I
DTX-498	EV00536799	EV00536800	February 26, 2016 email chain between C. Johnson and M. Quilter, re: "XW Royalty" and attachment thereto	PD; A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-499	EV0051260	EV0051267	November 25, 2009 email chain between C. Barrow, D. Foster, B. Grant, and D. Shultz re: State Farm Info Revised" and attachment thereto	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-500	EV00461532	EV00461598	February 9, 2009 email from C. Barrow to Y. Pikover and D. Lanahan, re: "Updated presentation"	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R; P
DTX-501	EV00971598	EV00971858	Document entitled "Digital Aerial Data RFP for LAR-IAC"	A; F; L; H; LF; PK; R
DTX-502	EV0050455	EV0050456	May 4, 2009 email from C. Barrow to A. Hudders, re: "FW: Guarantee Release" and attachment thereto	A; C; F; H; P
DTX-503	EV0055364	EV0055365	December 11, 2011 email chain between C. Barrow, H. Ellsworth, and K. Edwards re: "Fwd: EagleView patent PR" and attachment thereto	C; F; H; P
DTX-504	EV0044181	EV0044182	January 21, 2009 email chain between J. Dempsey and C. Barrow, et al., re: "Computing the area of a polygon"	C; F; H; P; R
DTX-505	EV0362317	EV0362318	February 26, 2009 email from C. Pershing to M. Smith, et al., re: "Home page text"	C; F; H; P; R
DTX-506	EV01553553	EV01553554	November 24, 2009 letter from M. Hutchings to Mr. Thornberry re: "David Carlsons Continuing Obligations Regarding Confidential Information Noncompetition, Nonsolicitation of Customers and Employees and Nondisparagement"	A; C; F; H; P; R; ML
DTX-507	EV0051027	EV0051028	September 3, 2009 email from C. Barrow to D. Foster and R. Daga, re: "FW: CONFIDENTIAL: Concerns"	A; F; H; L; LF; P; PK; R
DTX-508	EV0766489	EV0766489	April 16, 2015 email from R. Daga to C. Barrow, re: "Q1 Volumes - Insurance YOY"	A; F; H; L; LF; P; PK; R; C; I
DTX-509	EV00558095	EV00558095	March 20, 2014 email from C. Barrow to R. Daga, re: "RoofInsight"	A; F; H; L; LF; P; PK; R
DTX-510	XW00942517	XW00943139	Hartley & Zisserman, Multiple View Geometry in Computer Vision, Cambridge University Press (2000)	A; F; H; R; P; C
DTX-511	EV00044691	EV00044691	April 10, 2009 email from D. Schultz to C. Barrow, re: "New Subscription Contacts 4/10/2009"	A, F, H, C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-512	EV00047297	EV00047297	October 30, 2010 email from H. Ellsworth to C. Barrow, re: "GeoGucsstimator"	A, F, R, P, C
DTX-513	EV00540515	EV00540516	March 27, 2015 email from H. West to R. Daga, re: "FW: MG"	A, F, PK, Spec, R, P, ML
DTX-514	EV00544941	EV00544942	August 17, 2015 email from H. West to R. Daga, re: "MG Phone Calls"	A, F, R, P, C, ML
DTX-515	EV00544973	EV00544973	August 18, 2015 email from H. West to R. Daga, re: "MG Talking Points"	A, F, R, P, C, ML
DTX-516	EV00563241	EV00563243	September 30, 2015 email from B. Aoki to C. Alvaro, re: "RE: Sensopia Model/Vista Meeting"	A, F, R, P, C, PK, Spec, LC, 701, ML
DTX-517	EV00753227	EV00753227	May 12, 2012 email chain from H. West to E. Melton and R. Daga, re: "FW: Eagleview"	A, F, H, C
DTX-518	EV561562	EV561563	March 27, 2013 email chain from H. West to R. Daga, re: "FW: H & S Claim Recovery Systems"	A, F, H, R, P, C, PK, Spec
DTX-519	EV548310	EV548312	October 7, 2014 email chain from H. West to R. Daga and T. Rochman, re: "RE: Mobile App Suggestion"	A, F, R, P, C PK, Spec
DTX-520	EV0576601	EV0576602	September 18, 2015 email chain from R. Daga to J. Riggio, re: "FW: Revised SOW"	A, F, H, R, P, C, PK, Spec
DTX-521	EV0552762	EV0552763	March 17, 2015 email chain between H. West and R. Daga re: "EagleView Wall Report Case Study"	A, F, H, PK, P, C, ML
DTX-522	EV0451494	EV0451495	May 3, 2012 email chain from R. Daga and J. Polchin, et al., re: "FW: Aerialogics \$25 Gift Card"	R, P, C
DTX-523	EV453877	EV453877	August 22, 2012 email chain from R. Daga and C. Barrow, re: "Fwd: Return VM"	R, P, C
DTX-524	EV753268	EV753269	May 14, 2012 email chain from H. West to R. Daga and E. Melton, re: "RE: American Farmers & Ranchers"	A, F, R, P, C
DTX-525	EV562857	EV562858	September 11, 2015 email chain from H. West to K. Edwards and R. Daga, et al., re: "RE: re-branding"	A, F, R, P, C
DTX-526	EV542624	EV542626	May 14, 2015 email chain from C. Barrow to H. West and R. Daga, re: "Re: EXTERNAL: EagleView Agenda / Bios"	A, F, R, P, C, ML
DTX-527	VISTA-00001050	VISTA-00001053	June 2, 2015 email chain from M. Mickiewicz to T. Kellner, et al., re: "RE: Phoenix - Questions for Management (BAML)" and attachment	A, F, H, PK, R, P, C
DTX-528	VISTA-00002594	VISTA-00002599	June 2, 2015 email from T. Kellner to S. White, re: "Project Phoenix - Debt Financing Call Questions (2015-06-03) v2" and attachment	A, F, H, PK, R, P, C
DTX-529	VISTA-00002640	VISTA-00002670	Document entitled "Project Phoenix: Financial Due Report, June 8, 2015, Reliance Restricted, Final" by EY	A, F, H, R, P, C
DTX-530	EV615838	EV615867	October 4, 2013 email chain from J. Polchin to C. Barrow and B. Aoki, re: "FW: Process Letter"	R, P, C
DTX-531	XW00384537	XW00384634	Document entitled "Appli-Cad" with Declaration of Christopher Butler	R, P, C
DTX-532	EV376488	EV376500	Email from K. DeBoer to C. Barrow, re: "Team Meeting Notes 7.18.2012" and attachment	R, P, C
DTX-533	EV050318	EV050318	April 2, 2009 email from C. Barrow to C. Nussbeck, re: "EagleView Guarantee"	R
DTX-534	EV608821	EV608868	May 19, 2011 document entitled "Board of Director's Meeting"	R, P, C

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-535	EV448460	EV448484	Document entitled "Services Agreement" by Farmers Insurance Exchange	A, R, P, C, H
DTX-536	VISTA-00002241	VISTA-00002281	May 11, 2015 email from D. Sullivan to J. Hickley, et al., re: "Project Phoenix - Diligence Deck and Question List" and attachment	A, R, P, C, ML
DTX-537	VISTA-00000858	VISTA-00000885	May 29, 2015 email from D. Sullivan to A. Alonso, et al., re: "RE: Project Phoenix - Investment Committee Presentation" and attachment	A, R, P, C, ML
DTX-538	VISTA-00001542	VISTA-00001551	June 6, 2015 email from T. Kellner to S. White, re: "RE: EV" and attachment	A, R, P, C, ML
DTX-539	VISTA-00000918	VISTA-00000918	May 29, 2015 email from T. Kellner to T. Kellner, re: "EagleView DD Slide Notes"	A, R, P, C, ML, I
DTX-540	EV01553550	EV01553552	Ex. 4 to Dale Thornberry Deposition	A, R, P, C, H
DTX-541	EV01553555	EV01553585	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2010/0296693 A1, dated Nov. 25, 2010, by Thornberry et al.	R, P, C
DTX-542	EV01553465	EV01553465	Spreadsheet entitled "Pictometry International Corp. Ohoenix HoldCo LLC (Consolidated) Income Statement From Jan 2016 to Dec 2016"	A; F; L; PK; R
DTX-543	XW00082674	XW00082708	Document entitled "Xactware Solutions, Inc. Quarterly Review (Q4 2011)"	R, P, C
DTX-544	XW00943179	XW00943181	Roofshots.com Webpage	A, R, P, C, H, D
DTX-545	XW00943182	XW00943184	Roofshots.com Webpage	A, R, P, C, H, D
DTX-546	XW00943223	XW00943224	Document entitled "ISO Acquires Xactware, the Leading Provider of Estimation Software and Services for the Property Insurance Industry" from xactware.com	R, P, C, D
DTX-547	XW00943198	XW00943204	Document entitled "Skytek Imaging, Regular Roof Report, Saturday, April 25, 2015" from www.skytekimaging.com	A, R, P, C, H, D
DTX-548	XW00943194	XW00943197	Document entitled "Corelogic, SkyMeasure, PROFESSIONAL AERIAL MEASUREMENT, Created by Roofing Experts, For Roofing Experts" from https://www.corelogic.com/	A, R, P, C, H, D
DTX-549	XW00943177	XW00943178	Document entitled "Product Pricing" from ridgetopsketch.com/membership-pricing	A, R, P, C, H, PK, D
DTX-550	XW00943205	XW00943210	Document entitled "Solar" from www.eagleview.com/industry/energy/solar	R, C, F, H
DTX-551	XW00943146	XW00943149	Document entitled "EAGLEVIEW TECHNOLOGIES AND PICTOMETRY INTERNATIONAL ANNOUNCE MERGER, January 7, 2013" from www.eagleview.com	R, C, F, H
DTX-552	XW00943150	XW00943151	Document entitled "EAGLEVIEW® TECHNOLOGIES LAUNCHES AERIAL MEASUREMENT APP FOR ANDROID™, May 27, 2011" from www.eagleview.com	R, C, F, H, D
DTX-553	XW00943152	XW00943153	Document entitled "Commercial Contractors" from www.eagleview.com/industry/roofing/commercial-contractors	R, C, F, H, D
DTX-554	XW00943154	XW00943156	Document entitled "Construct" from www.eagleview.com/product/roof-material-ordering/construct/	R, C, F, H
DTX-555	XW00943157	XW00943160	Document entitled "EagleView PremiumReport" from www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/roof-products/eagleview-premiumreport/	R, C, F, H, D
DTX-556	XW00943161	XW00943163	Document entitled "QuickSquares" from www.eagleview.com/product/EagleView-measurements/roof-products/quicksquares	R, C, F, H, D
DTX-557	XW00943167	XW00943176	Document entitled "ClaimsReady Report, February 22, 2017"	R, C, F, H
DTX-558	XW00943185	XW00943193	Document entitled "Premium Report, February 21, 2017"	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK

Eagle View Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc., et. al.,
Civil Action No. 15-7025 (RBK) (JS) (DNJ)
Defendants' Trial Exhibit List

DTX-559	XW00943164	XW00943166	Document entitled "Wall Report" from www.eagleview.com/product/EagleView-measurements/other-measurement-products/wall-report	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-560	XW00943220	XW00943222	Document entitled "Create accurate estimates for restoration jobs of every kind" from www.xactware.com/en-us/solutions/claims-estimating/xactimate/professional	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-561	XW00943211	XW00943212	Document entitled "Remodelers can quickly sketch roof plans using aerial imagery" from www.verisk.com/archived/2012/new-xactremodel-includes-aerial-sketch/	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-562	XW00943218	XW00943219	Document entitled "About Xactware" from www.xactware.com/en-us/company/about	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-563	XW00943227	XW00943229	Document entitled "Geomni Property Features" from https://www.xactware.com/en-us/solutions/property-data/geomni-property/features#	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-564	XW00943140	XW00943145	Document entitled "EagleView Measurements" from https://www.eagleview.com/product/eagleview-measurements/	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-565	XW00943213	XW00943217	Document entitled "Xactimate" from https://www.xactware.com/en-us/solutions/claims-estimating/xactimate/273/aerial-sketch/	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-566	XW00943225	XW00943226	Document entitled "New tool lets property insurance professionals use aerial photos to dimension roofs" from xactware.com/en-us/company/news/archives/2011/xactware-releases-aerial-sketch-for-xactimate	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-567	XW00943230	XW00943237	www.eagleview.com 'Homepage'	R, C, F, H, D, A, PK
DTX-568	EV078051	EV078051	EagleView Competitor Spreadsheet (formerly PTX-037)	A, F, PK, Spec, P, O, 105
DTX-569	EV534636	EV534822	Agreement and Plan of Merger between Phoenix Holdco, Phoenix Merger, EagleView Technology, and Forties Advisors, June 15, 2015 (formerly PTX-712)	A, F, H, R, P, C, ML
DTX-570	EV01552441	EV01552464	United States Patent No. 9,501,700 to Loveland <i>et al.</i> (formerly PTX-376)	A, R, P, C, ML

Plaintiff's Objections Key

Eagle View Technologies, Inc. et al. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc. et. al.

Case No. 15-cv-07025 (RBK/JS) (Dist. N.J.)

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
A	Authentication or Identification (FRE 901) The requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.
Arg	Argumentative
AT	Attorney Objections Not Removed
BS	Beyond the Scope of Direct / Cross / Redirect Examination
30(b)(6)	Beyond the Scope of the Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Topic
C	Cumulative, Duplicative, Wasteful or Undue Delay (FRE 403) Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of duplicative and/or cumulative evidence.
Char	Improper Character Evidence (FRE 404)
Cmpd	Compound
Dem Only	Demonstrative / Should Not Be Admitted Into Evidence
D	Not Produced During Discovery
F	Lack of Foundation (FRE 602) Objectionable because a witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter.
H	Hearsay Rule (FRE 802) Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority or by Act of Congress.

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
I	Incomplete Document (FRE 106) Objectionable because document is incomplete and the introduction of the remaining portions or related documents ought, in fairness, to be considered contemporaneously with it.
IC	Improper Designation / Counter Designation (FRE 106: FRCP 32(a)(6))
ID	Incomplete Document (FRE 106)
In	Incomplete Testimony (FRE 106; FRCP 32(a)(6))
L	Lack of Personal Knowledge or Competency (FRE 602)
LA	Limited Admissibility (Admissible for Some Purposes but Not Others) (FRE 105)
LC	Legal Conclusion
LD	Leading (FRE 611)
LF	Lack of Foundation (FRE 103, 104 and/or 105)
M	Misleading/Mischaracterizes Prior Testimony (FRE 401-403, 611)
MD	Mischaracterizes Underlying. Document (FRE 401-403, 611)
ML	Subject to Motion In Limine
NE	Assumes Facts Not In Evidence
NR	Nonresponsive
NT	Not Testimony
O	Improper Lay or Expert Opinion (FRE 701-703)
OC	Offer to Compromise, Settlement (FRE 408)

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
P	<p>Prejudicial, Confusing, Vague and/or Misleading (FRE 403)</p> <p>Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.</p>
PD	<p>Post Dated Filing Date (FRE 105)</p> <p>If post-dated evidence is admitted as to one purpose but not admissible as for another purpose (e.g., for obviousness analysis), the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.</p>
PK	<p>Lack of Personal Knowledge (FRE 602)</p> <p>Objectionable because lack of personal knowledge makes the witness incompetent to testify about particular facts.</p>
R	<p>Relevance (FRE 401, 402)</p> <p>All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible.</p>
Spec	<p>Calls for Speculation (FRE 602)</p>
S	<p>Summaries (FRE 1006)</p> <p>The party relying on the summary must establish its accuracy to the court's satisfaction.</p> <p><i>See Graham, Handbook of Federal Evidence § 1006.1 (5th ed. 2001). United States v. Pelullo, 964 F.2d 193, 204 (3d Cir. 1992) ("It is well established that summary evidence is admissible under Rule 1006 only if the underlying materials upon which the summary is based are admissible.").</i></p>
U	<p>Untimely / Never Produced (FRCP 26, 37)</p>
V	<p>Vague / Ambiguous/Overbroad (FRE 611)</p>
W	<p>Privileged / Work Product (FRE 501/502)</p>
X	<p>Exhibit has not been provided, the copy provided is illegible, and/or the entry includes multiple documents.</p>

ABBREV.	OBJECTION
Y	Wrong Document Identified or Incorrectly Described
105	<p>Limited Admissibility (FRE 105)</p> <p>When evidence which is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.</p>
701	<p>Improper Lay Opinion Testimony (FRE 701)</p> <p>If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an opinion is limited as provided by this rule.</p>
1002	<p>Best Evidence (FRE 1002, 1003, 1004)</p> <p>An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless these rules or a federal statute provides otherwise.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504

PART VIII. PLAINTIFF'S STATEMENT OF THE LEGAL ISSUES IN THIS CASE:

1. Whether Defendants' Accused Products infringe at least Asserted Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 patent.
2. Whether Defendants' Accused Products infringe at least Asserted Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent.
3. Whether Defendants' Accused Products infringe at least Asserted Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 patent.
4. Whether Defendants' Accused Products infringe at least Asserted Claim 26 of the '454 patent.
5. Whether Defendants' Accused Products infringe at least Asserted Claim 12 of the '770 patent.
6. Whether Defendants' Accused Products infringe at least Asserted Claim 25 of the '737 patent.
7. Whether there has been direct infringement of at least Asserted Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 patent.
8. Whether there has been direct infringement of at least Asserted Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent.
9. Whether there has been direct infringement of at least Asserted Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 patent.
10. Whether there has been direct infringement of at least Asserted Claim 26 of the '454 patent.
11. Whether there has been direct infringement of at least Asserted Claim 12 of the '770 patent.
12. Whether there has been direct infringement of at least Asserted Claim 25 of the '737 patent.
13. Whether Defendants' infringement of the '436, '840, '376, '454, '770, and '737 patents is willful, and if so, the amount of increased damages assessed for Defendants' infringement to Plaintiff for the period of such willful infringement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.
14. Whether Defendants knowingly induced infringement and possessed specific intent to encourage another's infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) of Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 patent.

15. Whether Defendants knowingly induced infringement and possessed specific intent to encourage another's infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) of Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent.
16. Whether Defendants knowingly induced infringement and possessed specific intent to encourage another's infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) of Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 patent.
17. Whether Defendants knowingly induced infringement and possessed specific intent to encourage another's infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) of Claim 26 of the '454 patent.
18. Whether Defendants knowingly induced infringement and possessed specific intent to encourage another's infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) of Claim 12 of the '770 patent.
19. Whether Defendants knowingly induced infringement and possessed specific intent to encourage another's infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) of Claim 25 of the '737 patent.
20. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of the Accused Products, claimed in Claims 2 and 36 of the '436 patent, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1) of Claims 2 and 36 of the '436 patent.
21. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States any component of the Accused Products, claimed in Claims 2 and 36 of the '436 patent, that is especially made or especially adapted for use in the Accused Products and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(2) of Claims 2 and 36 of the '436 patent.
22. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of the Accused Products, claimed in Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1) of Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent.
23. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States any component of the Accused Products, claimed in Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent, that is especially made or especially adapted for use in the Accused Product and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(2) of Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent.
24. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of the Accused Products, claimed in Claims 20 and 23 of the '376 patent, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1) Claims 20 and 23 of the '376 patent.

25. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States any component of the Accused Products, claimed in Claims 20 and 23 of the '376 patent, that is especially made or especially adapted for use in the Accused Product and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(2) of Claims 20 and 23 of the '376 patent.
26. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of the Accused Products, claimed in Claim 25 of the '737 patent, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1) Claim 25 of the '737 patent.
27. Whether Xactware's supplying or causing to be supplied in or from the United States any component of the Accused Products, claimed in Claim 25 of the '737 patent, that is especially made or especially adapted for use in the Accused Product and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use, is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(2) of Claim 25 of the '737 patent.
28. Whether the importation of the Accused Products into the United States or offers to sell, sales, or uses of the Accused Products within the United States is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) of Claims 21 and 36 of the '436 patent.
29. Whether the importation of the Accused Products into the United States or offers to sell, sales, or uses of the Accused Products within the United States is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) of Claim 18 of the '840 patent.
30. Whether the importation of the Accused Products into the United States or offers to sell, sales, or uses of the Accused Products within the United States is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) of Claim 17 of the '376 patent.
31. Whether the importation of the Accused Products into the United States or offers to sell, sales, or uses of the Accused Products within the United States is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) of Claim 26 of the '454 patent.
32. Whether the importation of the Accused Products into the United States or offers to sell, sales, or uses of the Accused Products within the United States is infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) of Claim 12 of the '770 patent.
33. Whether Defendants' activities in connection with importing, offering to sell, selling, or using the Accused Products would constitute infringing activity under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) of Claim 25 of the '737 patent.
34. Whether Defendants have met their burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents are invalid under § 101.

35. Whether Defendants have met their burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
36. Whether Defendants have met their burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 patent are anticipated by the prior art and/or would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
37. Whether Defendants have met their burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 patent are anticipated by the prior art and/or would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
38. Whether Defendants have met their burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 26 of the '454 patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
39. Whether Defendants have met their burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 12 of the '770 patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
40. Whether Defendants have met their burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 25 of the '737 patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
41. Whether EagleView is entitled to damages beginning on the date of first infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 286 and 287.
42. Whether Plaintiff proved by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to damages of lost profits, including price erosion, and if so, the amount of lost-profits damages to compensate Plaintiff for Defendants' infringement.
43. Whether Plaintiff proved by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to damages of at least a reasonable royalty and, if so, the amount of reasonable-royalty damages to compensate for Defendants' infringement.
44. Whether any of Defendants' affirmative defenses bar or limit Plaintiff's claims for relief.
45. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a declaration that this case is exceptional and an award to Plaintiff of its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 285.
46. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to an accounting, and pre- and post-judgment interest and, if so, in what amount.

47. Whether Defendants' infringing sales of the Accused Products have resulted in irreparable harm to Plaintiffs, if so, whether monetary damages alone would be inadequate.
48. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to an injunction preventing Defendants from making, importing, using, offering for sale, and/or selling any product or service falling within the scope of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents, including Xactimate, Aerial Sketch v.2, the Mass Production Tool, Roof InSight (also known as Geomni Roof), and Property InSight (also known as Geomni Property) (collectively "Accused Products"), or otherwise infringing any Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents, or alternatively, for ongoing royalties for Defendants' ongoing infringement.
49. Whether Defendants have proven by the preponderance of the evidence that Plaintiff is equitably estopped from bringing this infringement action against Defendants.
50. Any evidentiary issues raised by pending motions or objections to evidence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

PART VIII. DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF THE LEGAL ISSUES IN THIS CASE:

1. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware directly and literally infringed Asserted Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 Patent.
2. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware directly and literally infringed Asserted Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 Patent.
3. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware directly and literally infringed Asserted Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 Patent.
4. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware directly and literally infringed Asserted Claim 26 of the '454 Patent.
5. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware directly and literally infringed Asserted Claim 12 of the '770 Patent.
6. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware directly and literally infringed Asserted Claim 25 of the '737 Patent.
7. Whether EagleView has shown that Defendants willfully infringed one or more Asserted Claims by showing that Defendants infringed and that Defendants knew of the risk of infringement, or that the risk of infringement was so obvious that Defendants should have known of it.
8. Whether EagleView has shown that Defendants knowingly induced another party to directly infringe Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 Patent, that Defendants had specific intent to encourage the infringement, and that the other party did directly infringe.
9. Whether EagleView has shown that Defendants knowingly induced another party to directly infringe Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 Patent, that Defendants had specific intent to encourage the infringement, and that the other party did directly infringe.
10. Whether EagleView has shown that Defendants knowingly induced another party to directly infringe Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 Patent, that Defendants had specific intent to encourage the infringement, and that the other party did directly infringe.
11. Whether EagleView has shown that Defendants knowingly induced another party to directly infringe Claim 26 of the '454 Patent, that Defendants had specific intent to encourage the infringement, and that the other party did directly infringe.
12. Whether EagleView has shown that Defendants knowingly induced another party to directly infringe Claim 12 of the '770 Patent, that Defendants had specific intent to encourage the infringement, and that the other party did directly infringe.
13. Whether EagleView has shown that Defendants knowingly induced another party to directly infringe Claim 25 of the '737 Patent, that Defendants had specific intent to encourage the infringement, and that the other party did directly infringe.

14. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware supplied in or from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of a product infringing Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 Patent and actively induced the combination of the components outside the United States such that the combination would be infringing or supplied in or from the United States a component especially made or adapted for use in a product that would infringe Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 Patent, with knowledge that such component would be combined outside the United States such that the combination would infringe.
15. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware supplied in or from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of a product infringing Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 Patent and actively induced the combination of the components outside the United States such that the combination would be infringing or supplied in or from the United States a component especially made or adapted for use in a product that would infringe Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 Patent, with knowledge that such component would be combined outside the United States such that the combination would infringe.
16. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware supplied in or from the United States all or a substantial portion of the components of a product infringing Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 Patent and actively induced the combination of the components outside the United States such that the combination would be infringing or supplied in or from the United States a component especially made or adapted for use in a product that would infringe Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 Patent, with knowledge that such component would be combined outside the United States such that the combination would infringe.
17. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware imported, offered to sell, sold, or used in the United States a product made by a process covered by Claims 2, 21, or 36 of the '436 Patent and that the product was not materially changed by a subsequent process and did not become a trivial or nonessential component of another product.
18. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware imported, offered to sell, sold, or used in the United States a product made by a process covered by Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 Patent and that the product was not materially changed by a subsequent process and did not become a trivial or nonessential component of another product.
19. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware imported, offered to sell, sold, or used in the United States a product made by a process covered by Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 Patent and that the product was not materially changed by a subsequent process and did not become a trivial or nonessential component of another product.
20. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware imported, offered to sell, sold, or used in the United States a product made by a process covered by Claim 26 of the '454 Patent and that the product was not materially changed by a subsequent process and did not become a trivial or nonessential component of another product.
21. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware imported, offered to sell, sold, or used in the United States a product made by a process covered by Claim 12 of the '770 Patent

and that the product was not materially changed by a subsequent process and did not become a trivial or nonessential component of another product.

22. Whether EagleView has shown that Xactware imported, offered to sell, sold, or used in the United States a product made by a process covered by Claim 25 of the '737 Patent and that the product was not materially changed by a subsequent process and did not become a trivial or nonessential component of another product.
23. Whether Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 Patent are unenforceable because they are directed to a patent-ineligible concept—such as a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea—and the other elements of the claims do not transform the claims into a patent-eligible application of the ineligible concept.
24. Whether Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 Patent are unenforceable because they are directed to a patent-ineligible concept—such as a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea—and the other elements of the claims do not transform the claims into a patent-eligible application of the ineligible concept.
25. Whether Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 Patent are unenforceable because they are directed to a patent-ineligible concept—such as a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea—and the other elements of the claims do not transform the claims into a patent-eligible application of the ineligible concept.
26. Whether Claim 26 of the '454 Patent is unenforceable because it is directed to a patent-ineligible concept—such as a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea—and the other elements of the claim do not transform the claim into a patent-eligible application of the ineligible concept.
27. Whether Claim 12 of the '770 Patent is unenforceable because it is directed to a patent-ineligible concept—such as a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea—and the other elements of the claim do not transform the claim into a patent-eligible application of the ineligible concept.
28. Whether Claim 25 of the '737 Patent is unenforceable because it is directed to a patent-ineligible concept—such as a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea—and the other elements of the claim do not transform the claim into a patent-eligible application of the ineligible concept.
29. Whether Claims 2, 21, and 36 of the '436 Patent are invalid because they are obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
30. Whether Claims 10 and 18 of the '840 Patent are invalid because they are anticipated by the prior art or obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
31. Whether Claims 17, 20, and 23 of the '376 Patent are invalid because they are anticipated by the prior art or obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

32. Whether Claim 26 of the '454 Patent is invalid because it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
33. Whether Claim 12 of the '770 Patent is invalid because it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
34. Whether Claim 25 of the '737 Patent is invalid because it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.
35. Whether any of the Asserted Claims is invalid because the invention thereof was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant(s).
36. Whether any of the Asserted Claims is invalid because the invention thereof was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent thereof.
37. Whether EagleView has shown that it is entitled to lost profits damages by showing that demand exists for EagleView product(s) covered by one or more of the Asserted Claims, that there are no products that are alternatives to the EagleView product(s) and are not covered by one or more of the Asserted Claims, that EagleView has the capacity to make Defendants' sales, and that lost profits damages are reasonably calculable.
38. Whether EagleView has shown that it is entitled to lost profits damages due to price erosion by showing that Defendants have infringed one or more Asserted Claims and that, but for infringement by Defendants, and not as a result of other market forces, EagleView would have been able to make profits on additional sales, and to charge higher prices for its products allegedly covered by one or more of the Asserted Claims.
39. Whether EagleView has shown that it is entitled to a reasonable royalty for past damages or an ongoing reasonable royalty in lieu of a permanent injunction by showing that feature(s) of the Accused Products infringe one or more of the Asserted Claims and by showing a reasonable royalty that is attributable to the feature(s).
40. Whether EagleView is estopped from asserting infringement because EagleView admitted, represented, and warranted that Defendants did not infringe its Asserted Patents.
41. Whether EagleView is estopped from asserting infringement because EagleView's misleading conduct led Defendants to reasonably believe that EagleView did not intend to enforce the Asserted Patents against Defendants, Defendants relied on that conduct, and, as a result, Defendants would be materially prejudiced if EagleView were permitted to proceed on its allegation of infringement.
42. Whether EagleView has shown that this case was exceptional with respect to the substantive strength of Defendants' litigating position or manner of litigating the case.
43. Whether EagleView has shown that it is entitled to pre-and post-judgment interest and, if so, in what amount.

44. Whether EagleView has shown that it would be irreparably harmed if its request for a permanent injunction is not granted; that EagleView would not be adequately compensated by a legal remedy; that the granting of an injunction is in the public interest; and that the balance of hardships favors the grant of an injunction.
45. Whether Defendants have shown that they are entitled to an injunction prohibiting EagleView, its officers, its agents, its servants, its employees, its attorneys, and those in active concert or participation with them directly or indirectly from asserting or threatening to assert infringement of any of the Asserted Claims against Defendants or any of their agents, employees, representatives, strategic business partners, distributors, contractors, customers, advisors, and investors.
46. Whether Defendants have shown that this case was exceptional with respect to the substantive strength of EagleView's litigating position or manner of litigating the case.
47. Whether any relief to EagleView should be barred or limited by any of Defendants' affirmative defenses.
48. Whether Defendants are entitled to judgment in their favor with regard to the foregoing, including invalidity, non-infringement, and lack of damages and entitlement to interest, as set forth above.
49. Any evidentiary issues raised in pre-trial motions or at trial.

Sealed by USCA

